


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:



Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date: **NOV 29 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 (the Act), 8 U.S.C. section 1182(a)(9)(B)(v).

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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.

Thank you,

Tariq Syed
for
Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico. He 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 one year or more and seeking admission within ten years of his last departure. He is married to a United States citizen. He 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).

The Acting District Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to his admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, his U.S. citizen spouse, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) on June 4, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant asserts through counsel that his spouse will experience extreme and unusual hardship in the form of medical, psychological, financial and economic hardship and the disparity in living conditions between Mexico and the United States. *Form I-290B*, received July 29, 2008.

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.

....

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in March 1991 and remained until he departed in July 2007. Therefore, the applicant was unlawfully present in the United States for over a year from April 1, 1997, the effective date of the unlawful presence provision of the Act, until July 2007, and is now seeking admission within ten years of his last departure from the United States. Accordingly, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. The applicant does not contest this finding.

The record includes, but is not limited to, counsel's brief; a statement from the applicant's spouse; copies of medical documents relating to the applicant and the applicant's spouse; a statement from [REDACTED] asserting the applicant's spouse recently had a low grade lesion with a colposcopy and cervical biopsy; copy of an Internet periodical on Mexico's educational system; a copy of the U.S. State Department's Travel Info, section on Mexico, published September 13, 2007;

bank statements for the applicant's spouse; copies of bills and utilities for the applicant's spouse; federal income tax returns and pay stubs for the applicant's spouse; and statements from friends and acquaintances of the applicant attesting to his moral character.

The entire record was reviewed and all relevant evidence considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides for a waiver of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) inadmissibility as follows:

The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] 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 . . . 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.

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 his children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's spouse 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) (“Mr. Arrieta 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.

With regard to hardship upon relocation, counsel for the applicant has asserted his spouse will experience medical, financial and economic hardship. *Brief in Support of Appeal*.

Counsel contends that the applicant’s spouse has a medical condition which would complicate relocating to Mexico, and that she has established relationships with her doctors and would not have

access to the same level of medical care or medical facilities to treat her medical conditions in Mexico. The record contains sufficient documentation to establish that the applicant's spouse had a low grade squamous intraepithelial lesion requiring a colposcopy and cervical biopsy and may need further surgical treatment. *Statement of* [REDACTED], dated June 20, 2008. The record also contains country conditions materials on the infrastructure in Mexico.

Counsel asserts the applicant's spouse experience financial hardship upon relocation because she would lose her U.S. job and career, would be unable to find employment in Mexico, would be unable to pay her debt in the United States and would not have access to career enhancing education. The record contains notices of late payments and disconnect notices for electrical and phone bills and documentation which establishes her employment.

Counsel also asserts that the applicant's children would experience extreme hardship upon relocation to Mexico, and that the biological father of his spouse's child from a previous marriage would not allow her to relocate. Children are not qualifying relatives in these proceedings, but in this case the assertions of the applicant's spouse indicate that the impacts on them would result in emotional hardship to the applicant's spouse, the qualifying relative. The applicant's spouse has submitted a statement asserting that relocation would result in extreme hardship to her children by denying the education, health and safety of life in the United States, and that the dangerous environment and poor educational infrastructure of Mexico would greatly impact them. *Statement of the applicant's spouse*. Counsel states that Mexico has a high rate of kidnapping and the fear of their children being kidnapped terrifies the applicant and his spouse. The AAO would note that the current Travel Warning for Mexico mentions Nuevo Leon, where the applicant lives, and advises U.S. citizens to be highly vigilant when travelling through the area. *Travel Warning*, U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Mexico, September 10, 2010.

When these hardship factors are considered in the aggregate, they establish that the impacts on the applicant's spouse rise above the impacts commonly experienced by the relatives of inadmissible aliens who relocate, and as such, establish extreme hardship upon relocation to Mexico.

With regard to hardship upon separation, if the applicant's spouse were to remain in the United States, counsel asserts the applicant will experience medical, emotional and financial hardship.

Counsel asserts that the applicant's spouse suffers from a medical condition, specifically, a "low grade" lesion in her cervix. The record contains sufficient documentation to establish that the applicant's spouse had a low grade squamous intraepithelial lesion requiring a colposcopy and cervical biopsy and may need further surgical treatment. *Statement of* [REDACTED] dated June 20, 2008. The applicant's spouse has submitted a letter asserting that her medical condition and financial stress heighten her psychological and emotional stress, and that she is depressed and anxious with a wide variety of somatic symptoms. The record contains medical records establishing her medical condition, periodicals on mental health and depression and country conditions materials.

The applicant's spouse has also asserted that she cannot afford her bills, afford to continue her education without the applicant, cannot maintain her standard of living and that she has accumulated \$100,000 in debt and has \$2,807 in monthly bills. *Statement of the applicant's spouse* (undated). The record contains tax returns, pay stubs, utilities and invoices for monthly bills. The record also contains copies of late payment notices and disconnect notices for electrical and phone bills. The record reflects that the applicant's spouse would be raising two children alone in the United States

When the hardship factors in this case are considered in the aggregate, they establish that the impacts on the applicant's spouse will rise above those commonly experienced by the relatives of inadmissible aliens who remain in the United States, and as such, establish extreme hardship.

As the record establishes that a qualifying relative will experience extreme hardship upon relocation and upon separation, the AAO may now consider whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

The AAO additionally finds that the applicant merits a waiver of inadmissibility as a matter of discretion. In discretionary matters, the alien bears the burden of proving eligibility in terms of equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. *See Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957).

In evaluating whether section 212(h)(1)(B) relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the factors adverse to the alien include the nature and underlying circumstances of the exclusion ground at issue, the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws, the existence of a criminal record, and if so, its nature and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of the alien's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country. The favorable considerations include family ties in the United States, residence of long duration in this country (particularly where alien began residency at a young age), evidence of hardship to the alien and his family if he is excluded and deported, service in this country's Armed Forces, a history of stable employment, the existence of property or business ties, evidence of value or service in the community, evidence of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and other evidence attesting to the alien's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends and responsible community representatives).

See Matter of Mendez-Morales, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). The AAO must then, "[B]alance the adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented on the alien's behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of the country." *Id.* at 300. (Citations omitted).

The AAO finds that the unfavorable factor in this case includes the applicant's unlawful presence and unauthorized employment. The favorable factors in this case include the presence of the applicant's spouse and the hardship she would experience, the presence of his U.S. citizen children, and the lack of any criminal record. The favorable factors in this case outweigh the negative factors, therefore favorable discretion will be exercised. The appeal will be sustained.

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 rests with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.