

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



176

FILE: [Redacted] Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ)  
(CDJ 1999 773 067 relates)

Date: MAR 29 2010

IN RE: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v)  
of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the 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. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of 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 married to a lawful permanent resident and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to reside with his wife in the United States.

The district director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated June 14, 2007.

The record contains, *inter alia*: a copy of the marriage certificate of the applicant and his wife, indicating they were married on September 21, 1998; copies of claim for disability benefits; and an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(i) In General

Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who -

....  
(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.

....  
(v) Waiver. – The Attorney General [now the Secretary of 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.

In this case, the district director found, and the applicant does not contest, that he entered the United States in 1993 without inspection and remained until September 2000. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of enactment of unlawful presence provisions under the Act, until his departure from the United States in September 2000. Therefore, the applicant accrued unlawful presence of over three years. He now seeks admission within ten years of his September 2000 departure. Accordingly, he is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

A section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. *See* section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v). Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

*Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-66 (BIA 1999), provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship under the Act. These factors 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.

In this case, the applicant's wife, [REDACTED], states that since her husband's departure from the United States, she has been suffering a lot. [REDACTED] contends she "had a major surgery and [she] became disable[d]." She claims she needs her husband to help her with her daily living and that if he stays in Mexico, she will die. *Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B)*, dated June 28, 2007. Medical documentation in the record indicates [REDACTED] had an abdominal hysterectomy due to bleeding uterine fibroids on November 14, 2005. *Supplementary Report of Claim – Statutory Disability Benefits*, dated December 21, 2005; *Notice and Proof of Claim for Disability Benefits*, dated November 23, 2005.

After a careful review of the record, there is insufficient evidence to show that [REDACTED] has suffered or will suffer extreme hardship if her husband's waiver application were denied.

The AAO recognizes that [REDACTED] has endured hardship since the applicant departed the United States and is sympathetic to the couple's circumstances. However, [REDACTED] does not discuss the possibility of moving back to Mexico, where she was born, to avoid the hardship of separation, and she does not address whether such a move would represent a hardship to her. If [REDACTED] decides to stay in the United States, their situation is typical of individuals separated as a result of removal or inadmissibility and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record.

Federal courts and the BIA have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. For example, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *See also Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) (uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported).

With respect to [REDACTED] contention that she had a major surgery and became disabled, although the record shows she underwent a hysterectomy in 2005, there is no indication that this surgery caused any permanent disability as she claims. In fact, documentation in the record indicates that [REDACTED] was “able to perform usual work” beginning January 4, 2006. *Supplementary Report of Claim, supra*; *Notice and Proof of Claim for Disability Benefits, supra*. The medical documentation in the record provides no indication that [REDACTED] currently requires any assistance or any further treatment. *Supplementary Report of Claim, supra* (indicating “F/up in 6 mths” in response to the question “[a]re any further treatments necessary?”).

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant’s wife caused by the applicant’s inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he 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 proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.