

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

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CLEVELAND, OHIO Date: **SEP 09 2010**

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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

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.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Cleveland, Ohio. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained and the waiver application will be approved.

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 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 and again seeking admission within ten years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant is married to a United States citizen. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his spouse.

In a decision dated September 6, 2007, the Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish that his qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of his inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director* dated September 6, 2007.

On appeal, the applicant's attorney provided a brief on his behalf. In the brief, the attorney contends that the applicant's qualifying relative, his wife, would face safety concerns and medical issues should she relocate to Mexico. In addition, the brief asserts that the applicant's wife would experience financial, emotional and medical hardships if the applicant returns to Mexico without her.

The record contains Biographic Information (Form G-325A) regarding the applicant, an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130), an Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601), a Notice of Appeal (Form I-290B), an appeal letter from the applicant's attorney accompanied by updated information from the Department of State regarding the security situation in Mexico, a letter from the attorney regarding the case provided with the Form I-601, an affidavit from the qualifying relative, some medical documentation regarding the qualifying relative, country condition information regarding Mexico and pictures of the applicant and his family. In addition, the record contains evidence including financial information regarding the applicant and his wife and a psychological report regarding his wife, which was provided in response to a request for evidence (Form I-72) and with the applications submitted for adjustment.

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

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(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.

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. ██████ 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.

The applicant’s qualifying relative in this case is his wife, who is a United States citizen.

The applicant first entered the United States on June 18, 1993 on a visitor’s visa, which expired on December 17, 1993, and remained in the United States until a date uncertain after August 12, 1999, when he was granted advance parole. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997 the date of enactment of the unlawful presence provisions, until April 26, 1999, the date on which

his initial Form I-485 Application for Adjustment of Status was filed,¹ a period in excess of one year. The applicant departed the United States sometime after his grant of advance parole on August 12, 1999 and before his return on January 4, 2000, triggering the unlawful provisions of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. It appears that the applicant may have accrued additional periods of unlawful presence, but such time periods are unclear from the record. In applying for adjustment of status, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of his departure from the United States. The applicant has not disputed his inadmissibility. Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

The evidence provided relating to the potential hardships facing the applicant's spouse includes Form I-601, Form I-290B, an appeal letter from the applicant's attorney accompanied by updated information from the Department of State regarding the security situation in Mexico, a letter from the attorney regarding the case provided with the Form I-601, an affidavit from the qualifying relative, some medical documentation regarding the qualifying relative, country condition information regarding Mexico and pictures of the applicant and his family. In addition, the record contains evidence including financial information regarding the applicant and his wife and a psychologist's report regarding the wife.

The applicant must first establish that his United States citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship were she to remain in the United States while the applicant resides abroad due to his inadmissibility. With respect to this criterion, the applicant's attorney contends that the applicant's spouse will suffer emotional, financial and medical hardships should the applicant not be granted a waiver. The declaration from the applicant's spouse, the psychologist's report, and the letters from applicant's attorney, all support the contention that the applicant's presence is crucial for her spouse's emotional well-being, indicating that the applicant's spouse's prior depressive condition could be exacerbated by the applicant's removal to Mexico. While the applicant's spouse's psychological issues alone would not be enough to warrant a finding of extreme hardship, such problems have been analyzed in the context of her other hardships. Moreover, the declaration from the applicant's spouse also asserts issues with her thyroid, however substantial documentation of this condition was not provided. In fact, a letter from Dr. [REDACTED] dated May 11, 2006, stated that an "ultrasound of the thyroid gland revealed a possible nodule in the left lobe of the thyroid gland. Otherwise, the ultrasound appeared normal." As such, there was not sufficient evidence to demonstrate that she had a serious thyroid condition.

The applicant's attorney asserts that due to the applicant's inadmissibility, his qualifying spouse will experience financial hardship because she relies on the applicant's income. The record indicates that the applicant contributes almost twice as much income to the marriage as his spouse, which was confirmed through tax returns and a letter from the employer of the applicant's spouse. Additionally, the income of the applicant's spouse would not be enough to support herself and her daughter as evidenced by the financial documentation in the record. Therefore, the qualifying spouse would suffer financial hardships should she remain in the United States without the applicant.

¹ The proper filing of an application for adjustment of status is an exception which tolls accrual of unlawful presence.

The record reflects that the cumulative effect of the emotional and financial hardships the applicant's spouse would experience living in the United States without her husband rises to the level of extreme.

Extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must also be established in the event that she accompanies the applicant abroad based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. With respect to this criterion, the applicant's attorney asserts that the applicant's spouse would face safety concerns and medical issues should she relocate to Mexico. Country condition information was provided to support the safety concerns voiced by the applicant's spouse in her affidavit. Further, the country condition information also indicated that the area where the applicant is from appears to be particularly dangerous.

In addition, the applicant's spouse asserts that that if she moved to Mexico she would lose her current employment, which provides healthcare benefits. The applicant provided documentation of the prescriptions that she is taking, so it appears that her loss of health insurance would affect her ability to continue to take her medicines. As such, the applicant would suffer a loss from her gainful employment as a nursing assistant, a position she has held since 2004, and her accompanying benefits. Moreover, as a native born United States citizen, the applicant's spouse would have to adjust to a new culture. See *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* at 568; *Matter of Pilch* at 631-32; *Matter of Ige* at 883; *Matter of Ngai* at 246-47; *Matter of Kim* at 89-90; *Matter of Shaughnessy* at 813. Therefore, the AAO concludes that based on a totality of the circumstances, the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship were she to relocate to Mexico to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility.

Considered in the aggregate, the applicant has established that his spouse would face extreme hardship if the applicant's waiver request is denied.

Extreme hardship is a requirement for eligibility, but once established it is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). For waivers of inadmissibility, the burden is on the applicant to establish that a grant of a waiver of inadmissibility is warranted in the exercise of discretion. *Id.* at 299. The adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident must be balanced with the social and humane considerations presented on his behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of this country. *Id.* at 300.

The AAO notes that *Matter of Marin*, 16 I & N Dec. 581 (BIA 1978), involving a section 212(c) waiver, is used in waiver cases as guidance for balancing favorable and unfavorable factors and this cross application of standards is supported by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). In *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, the BIA, assessing the exercise of discretion under section 212(h) of the Act, stated:

We find this use of *Matter of Marin*, *supra*, as a general guide to be appropriate. For the most part, it is prudent to avoid cross application, as between different types of relief, of particular principles or standards for the exercise of discretion. *Id.* However,

our reference to *Matter of Marin, supra*, is only for the purpose of the approach taken in that case regarding the balancing of favorable and unfavorable factors within the context of the relief being sought under section 212(h)(1)(B) of the Act. *See, e.g., Palmer v. INS*, 4 F.3d 482 (7th Cir.1993) (balancing of discretionary factors under section 212(h)). We find this guidance to be helpful and applicable, given that both forms of relief address the question of whether alien with criminal records should be admitted to the United States and allowed to reside in this country permanently.

Matter of Mendez-Moralez at 300.

In *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, in evaluating whether section 212(h)(1)(B) relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the BIA stated that:

The factors adverse to the applicant 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, recency and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of an 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 the alien began his 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 and service to 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). . . .

Id. at 301.

The BIA further states that upon review of the record as a whole, a balancing of the equities and adverse matters must be made to determine whether discretion should be favorably exercised. The equities that the applicant for section 212(h)(1)(B) relief must bring forward to establish that he merits a favorable exercise of administrative discretion will depend in each case on the nature and circumstances of the ground of exclusion sought to be waived and on the presence of any additional adverse matters, and as the negative factors grow more serious, it becomes incumbent upon the applicant to introduce additional offsetting favorable evidence. *Id.* at 301.

The favorable factors in this matter are the extreme hardship the applicant's United States citizen spouse would face if the applicant were to remain in Mexico, regardless of whether she accompanied the applicant or remained in the United States, his ties to the United States, the financial support he provides to his wife and step-child and the amount of time that he has lived in the United States. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's unlawful entry to the United States, his unlawful presence while in the United States and a substantial number of traffic violations.

Although the applicant's violations of immigration law cannot be condoned, the positive factors in this case outweigh the negative factors. In these proceedings, the burden of establishing eligibility for the waiver rests entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In this case, the applicant has met his burden and the appeal will be sustained.

The AAO notes that on February 28, 2007 the applicant received a final order of removal. As such, it is necessary that the applicant file an Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) and have it approved in order to adjust his status.²

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.

² In a letter dated July 18, 2007, counsel indicates that it is unnecessary for the applicant to apply for permission to reapply for admission because he has not departed.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act states in pertinent part:

(A) Certain alien previously removed.-

(i) Arriving aliens.-Any alien who has been ordered removed under section 235(b)(1) or at the end of proceedings under section 240 initiated upon the alien's arrival in the United States and who again seeks admission within 5 years of the date of such removal (or within 20 years in the case of a second or subsequent removal or at any time in the case of an alien convicted of an aggravated felony) is inadmissible.

The applicant is an arriving alien. By applying for adjustment of status the applicant is applying for admission and is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act and requires permission to reapply. 8 C.F.R. § 212.2(j) allows for advanced approval of a Form I-212.