

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

H6

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: PHOENIX, ARIZONA

Date: **NOV 09 2010**

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to 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:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently \$585, but will increase to \$630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the \$630 fee. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Phoenix, Arizona. 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 her husband and children in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated April 10, 2008.

On appeal, counsel contends, in part, that the applicant is not inadmissible for being unlawfully present in the United States because she was subsequently admitted into the country. According to counsel, the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) should be “stopped” from now finding the applicant inadmissible as the applicant would never have left the country had she known about the consequences of her departure. Counsel contends that in the alternative, the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to her spouse and her waiver application should be approved.

The record contains, *inter alia*: a letter and an affidavit from the applicant’s husband, [REDACTED] an affidavit from the applicant; several letters of support; a copy of the U.S. Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for Mexico and articles addressing country conditions in Mexico; letters from the applicant’s and [REDACTED] employers; tax and financial documents; photographs of the applicant and her family; and an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form-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 record reflects that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in 1990 and remained until her departure in August 2002. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of enactment of unlawful presence provisions under the Act, until her departure from the United States in August 2002. The applicant accrued unlawful presence of over five years. She now seeks admission within ten years of her August 2002 departure from the United States. Accordingly, she is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year and seeking admission to the United States within ten years of her last departure.

Regarding counsel's contention that the USCIS should be precluded from finding the applicant inadmissible because she was subsequently admitted into the United States as a V-1 nonimmigrant, counsel provides no authority or precedent for this contention. Significantly, the applicant does not contest the fact that she initially entered the United States without inspection and that she departed the country more than one year later in August 2002, triggering the unlawful presence provisions under the Act. Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act does not bar V status, and a V nonimmigrant does not accrue further time in unlawful presence while maintaining this status, but nothing in the statute or implementing regulations provides that V status relieves an alien of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act. Section 101(a)(15)(V) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.15(i)(3)(i), (ii). A V nonimmigrant must obtain a waiver of such inadmissibility when he or she applies for adjustment of status. 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.15(i)(3)(i), (ii).

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act is dependent on a showing that the bar to admission imposes extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, which includes the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant or her children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's husband is the only qualifying relative in this case. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, the applicant is statutorily eligible for a waiver, and USCIS then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

As a qualifying relative is not required to depart the United States as a consequence of an applicant's inadmissibility, two distinct factual scenarios exist should a waiver application be denied: either the

qualifying relative will join the applicant to reside abroad or the qualifying relative will remain in the United States. Ascertaining the actual course of action that will be taken is complicated by the fact that an applicant may easily assert a plan for the qualifying relative to relocate abroad or to remain in the United States depending on which scenario presents the greatest prospective hardship, even though no intention exists to carry out the alleged plan in reality. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 885 (BIA 1994) (addressing separation of minor child from both parents applying for suspension of deportation). Thus, we interpret the statutory language of the various waiver provisions in section 212 of the Act to require an applicant to establish extreme hardship to his or her qualifying relative(s) under both possible scenarios. To endure the hardship of separation when extreme hardship could be avoided by joining the applicant abroad, or to endure the hardship of relocation when extreme hardship could be avoided by remaining in the United States, is a matter of choice and not the result of removal or inadmissibility. As the Board of Immigration Appeals stated in *Matter of Ige*:

[W]e consider the critical issue . . . to be whether a child would suffer extreme hardship if he accompanied his parent abroad. If, as in this case, no hardship would ensue, then the fact that the child might face hardship if left in the United States would be the result of parental choice, not the parent's deportation.

Id. See also *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996).

Extreme hardship is "not a definable term of fixed and inflexible content or meaning," but "necessarily depends upon the facts and circumstances peculiar to each case." *Matter of Hwang*, 10 I&N Dec. 448, 451 (BIA 1964). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). The 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. *Id.* The Board added that not all of the foregoing factors need be analyzed in any given case and emphasized that the list of factors was not exclusive. *Id.* at 566.

The Board has also held that the common or typical results of deportation, removal and inadmissibility do not constitute extreme hardship, and has listed certain individual hardship factors considered common rather than extreme. These factors include: economic disadvantage, loss of current employment, inability to maintain one's present standard of living, inability to pursue a chosen profession, separation from family members, severing community ties, cultural readjustment after living in the United States for many years, cultural adjustment of qualifying relatives who have never lived outside the United States, inferior economic and educational opportunities in the foreign country, or inferior medical facilities in the foreign country. See generally *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 568; *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. at 631-32; *Matter of Ige*, 20

I&N Dec. at 883; *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246-47 (Comm'r 1984); *Matter of Kim*, 15 I&N Dec. 88, 89-90 (BIA 1974); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810, 813 (BIA 1968).

However, though hardships may not be extreme when considered abstractly or individually, the Board has made it clear that “[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) (quoting *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 882). The adjudicator “must consider the entire range of factors concerning hardship in their totality and determine whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation.” *Id.*

We observe that the actual hardship associated with an abstract hardship factor such as family separation, economic disadvantage, cultural readjustment, et cetera, differs in nature and severity depending on the unique circumstances of each case, as does the cumulative hardship a qualifying relative experiences as a result of aggregated individual hardships. *See, e.g., In re Bing Chih Kao and Mei Tsui Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45, 51 (BIA 2001) (distinguishing *Matter of Pilch* regarding hardship faced by qualifying relatives on the basis of variations in the length of residence in the United States and the ability to speak the language of the country to which they would relocate).

Family separation, for instance, has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal in some cases. *See Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. at 813. Nevertheless, family ties are to be considered in analyzing hardship. *See Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 565-66. The question of whether family separation is the ordinary result of inadmissibility or removal may depend on the nature of family relationship considered. For example, in *Matter of Shaughnessy*, the Board considered the scenario of parents being separated from their soon-to-be adult son, finding that this separation would not result in extreme hardship to the parents. *Id.* at 811-12; *see also U.S. v. Arrieta*, 224 F.3d 1076, 1082 (9th Cir. 2000) (██████████ was not a spouse, but a son and brother. It was evident from the record that the effect of the deportation order would be separation rather than relocation.”). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board considered the scenario of the respondent’s spouse accompanying him to Mexico, finding that she would not experience extreme hardship from losing “physical proximity to her family” in the United States. 22 I&N Dec. at 566-67.

The decision in *Cervantes-Gonzalez* reflects the norm that spouses reside with one another and establish a life together such that separating from one another is likely to result in substantial hardship. It is common for both spouses to relocate abroad if one of them is not allowed to stay in the United States, which typically results in separation from other family members living in the United States. Other decisions reflect the expectation that minor children will remain with their parents, upon whom they usually depend for financial and emotional support. *See, e.g., Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 886 (“[I]t is generally preferable for children to be brought up by their parents.”). Therefore, the most important single hardship factor may be separation, particularly where spouses and minor children are concerned. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *Cerrillo-Perez*, 809 F.2d at 1422.

Regardless of the type of family relationship involved, the hardship resulting from family separation is determined based on the actual impact of separation on an applicant, and all hardships must be considered in determining whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond the consequences ordinarily associated with removal or inadmissibility. *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. at 383. Nevertheless, though we require an applicant to show that a qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship both in the event of relocation and in the event of separation, in analyzing the latter scenario, we give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship of separation itself, particularly in cases involving the separation of spouses from one another and/or minor children from a parent. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293.

In this case, the applicant's husband, [REDACTED] states that he met the applicant when he was sixteen years old and the applicant was thirteen years old. He states that they dated for years and then lived with his parents for four years before they could afford their own place. [REDACTED] states that they have four U.S. citizen children, the oldest of whom is in her last year of high school and the youngest of whom is in first grade. According to [REDACTED] if the applicant's waiver application were denied, his oldest daughter would need to drop out of school to help her siblings and do household chores. [REDACTED] contends it would be devastating for him and his children to move to Mexico. He states that doing manual labor in Mexico does not pay as much as it does in the United States and that his children's education would suffer if they moved to Mexico. *Affidavit of* [REDACTED] dated September 11, 2007; *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated February 20, 2006.

The applicant states that she and her husband have never been separated. According to the applicant, her husband does not have time to take care of their four children because of his work as a tractor driver. The applicant states that she works in the field during the lettuce season and that when she works, she asks her mother to help with the children. The applicant states that all of their family is in the United States and that her children will be traumatized either if she has to depart the country, or if they have to leave their home to live in a country where they have never lived before. *Affidavit of* [REDACTED] dated September 11, 2007.

After a careful review of the evidence, the record does not show that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's waiver being denied.

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's husband, [REDACTED] will endure hardship upon the applicant's departure and is sympathetic to the family's circumstances. However, if [REDACTED] decides to remain in the United States, their situation is typical of individuals separated as a result of inadmissibility and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. Federal courts and the Board of Immigration Appeals have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. For example, *Matter of Pilch, supra*, 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 (9th 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 (9th 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).

Regarding the financial hardship claim, the AAO finds that the hardship [REDACTED] would experience is not extreme. According to the most recent tax returns in the record, in 2006, [REDACTED] earned \$43,068 and the applicant earned \$8,533. *2006 Wage and Tax Statements (Form W-2)*. In addition, [REDACTED] submitted a Form I-864, affirming he would financially support the applicant based on his salary alone of \$39,076. *Affidavit of Support under Section 213A of the Act (Form I-864)*, dated May 18, 2005. Furthermore, the record shows that the couple's children are currently nine, seventeen, nineteen, and twenty-one years old. Therefore, the couple's older children may be able to financially assist the family. *Cf. Affidavit of [REDACTED] supra* (stating that the two older children had summer jobs and were able to buy what they needed for school themselves).

Furthermore, the record does not show that [REDACTED] moving back to Mexico, where he was born and where he married the applicant, would amount to extreme hardship. The record shows that [REDACTED] is currently forty-years-old. There is no claim that either [REDACTED] or the couple's children, suffer from any medical or mental health issues. In addition, [REDACTED] does not claim that he does not speak Spanish and there is no evidence to show that his transition to moving back to Mexico would be any more difficult than would normally be expected under the circumstances.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's husband 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 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 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.