

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Immigration and Citizenship Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



H6

FILE:

CDJ 1993 846 235

Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date:

MAR 06 2010

IN RE: Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v),  
of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City, Mexico, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant, [REDACTED] is a citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year. The applicant is the daughter of a lawful permanent resident of the United States. The applicant sought a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), so as to immigrate to the United States. The director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that her bar to admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated April 17, 2007. The applicant filed a timely appeal.

On appeal, the applicant's mother states that her daughter gained admission into the United States by presenting her B1/B2 Visa and Border Crossing Card. She claims that the U.S. Border Patrol Agent permitted her daughter's admission without a permit, even though she had asked for a permit. The applicant's mother states that since her daughter used the B1/B2 Visa and Border Crossing Card to enter the country she was not residing unlawfully here. She declares that they have always applied for a permit and assumed that daughter's possession of a passport and B1/B2 Visa and Border Crossing Card meant her entry was proper. The applicant's mother indicates that if her daughter, husband, and child were with her they would have better opportunities.

Inadmissibility for unlawful presence is found under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act. That section provides, in part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, voluntarily departed the United States . . . and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, or

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

The applicant claims that she gained admission into the United States by presenting her B1/B2 Visa and Border Crossing Card to a U.S. Border Patrol Agent. She asserts that she was not provided with a stamped permit (Form I-94, Arrival Departure Record). However, the applicant offers no proof in support of her claim that she presented herself at a port of entry. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Furthermore, the maximum period of stay granted for a holder of the B1/B2 Visa and Border Crossing Card is six months. The applicant has conceded that she was admitted to the United States in August 2000 and remained until July 2002. Even if the applicant had gained admission to the United States as she states, she would have begun to accrue unlawful presence six months after her arrival in the United States. Thus, she would have accrued unlawful presence from April 2001 until July 2002, and would have triggered the ten-year bar when she left the country, rendering her inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

The waiver for unlawful presence is found under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. That section provides that:

- (v) Waiver. – The Attorney General [now Secretary, Homeland Security, “Secretary”] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien.

The waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act is dependent upon a showing that the bar to admission imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, *i.e.*, the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to an applicant is not a consideration under the statute, and will be considered only to the extent that it results in hardship to a qualifying relative, who in this case is the applicant’s lawful permanent resident mother. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in determining whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

“Extreme hardship” is not a definable term of “fixed and inflexible meaning”; establishing extreme hardship is “dependent upon the facts and circumstances of each case.” *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* lists the factors considered relevant in determining whether an applicant has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. The factors relate to an applicant’s qualifying relative and include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative’s family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative’s ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate. *Id.* at 565-566.

The factors to consider in determining whether extreme hardship exists “provide a framework for analysis,” and the “[r]elevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists.” *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996). The trier of fact considers the entire range of hardship factors in their totality and then determines “whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation.” (citing *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 882 (BIA 1994).

In rendering this decision, the AAO has carefully considered all of the evidence in the record, including the letters by the applicant’s mother.

The AAO notes that the letter dated April 24, 2006 does not have an English language translation. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3) states:

(3) Translations. Any document containing foreign language submitted to USCIS shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator’s certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English.

In that the letter is written completely in Spanish and has no translation, the letter will carry no weight in this proceeding.

Applying the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors here, extreme hardship to the applicant’s mother must be established in the event that she remains in the United States without the applicant, and alternatively, if she joins the applicant to live in Mexico. A qualifying relative is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant’s waiver request.

The applicant’s mother conveys that her family members, including the applicant, would have better opportunities in the United States. However, the applicant’s mother does not indicate the hardship that she would experience if she remained in the United States without the applicant. Furthermore, the applicant’s mother does not claim that she would experience any hardship if she were to join her daughter to live in Mexico.

When the factors presented in this case are considered collectively, they do not constitute extreme hardship to a qualifying family member for purposes of relief under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.