

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: **SEP 15 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:



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, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

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 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 seeking readmission within ten years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant is married to a United States citizen and the mother of three children. She is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The applicant 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 in the United States with her United States citizen husband and children.

The Acting District Director found that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on the applicant's spouse and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Acting District Director*, dated April 23, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, claims that the applicant's husband is suffering extreme hardship through his separation from the applicant and he cannot join her in Mexico. *See counsel's appeal brief, attached to Form I-290B*, dated May 23, 2008.

The record includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant's husband in English and Spanish¹; letters of support for the applicant and her husband; a letter from the applicant's husband's employer; a psychological evaluation for the applicant's husband; a prescription note in Spanish; utility bills, credit card statements, and household bills; wage statements and money transfer receipts; and citizenship and residency documents for the applicant's husband's family in the United States. The entire record was reviewed and considered, with the exception of the Spanish language documents, in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

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-

....

¹ Pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3), an applicant who submits a document in a foreign language must provide a certified English-language translation of that document. As a statement from the applicant's husband and a prescription note are in Spanish and are not accompanied by an English-language translation, the AAO will not consider them in this proceeding.

(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 [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 the present case, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States in January 2003 without inspection. In September 2007, the applicant voluntarily departed the United States. On September 28, 2007, the applicant filed a Form I-601. On April 23, 2008, the Acting District Director denied the Form I-601, finding that the applicant had accrued more than a year of unlawful presence and had failed to demonstrate extreme hardship to her United States citizen spouse.

The applicant accrued unlawful presence from January 2003, the date she entered the United States without inspection, until September 2007, the date she voluntarily departed the United States. The applicant is seeking admission into the United States within ten years of her September 2007 departure. The applicant is, therefore, 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.

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 United States Citizenship and Immigration Service (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 (Board) 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.

Counsel claims that the applicant’s husband “has family ties in the United States” and has “no siblings or close relatives in Mexico whatsoever.” In a statement dated May 22, 2008, the applicant’s husband

states they “make family reunions often.” The AAO notes that the record establishes that the applicant’s husband’s immediate family members are United States citizens and lawful permanent residents of the United States. Counsel states that the applicant’s husband attended school in the United States. The applicant’s husband states “[i]t will be very hard to leave [his] country; the United States is the only country and the only culture that [he] [has] known.” He states that that he works as a construction worker and if he joins the applicant in Mexico, he will not “be able to find a good job. Construction workers don’t make too much money in Mexico.” The AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s husband has been residing in the United States for many years and that he may experience hardship in relocating to Mexico.

In an evaluation dated October 14, 2007, [REDACTED] states the applicant’s daughter suffers from “a rash around her neck and covering most of her body.... In Mexico, doctors do not know what it is. Although, the child has been prescribed medications they are not working.” Additionally, [REDACTED] states the applicant’s husband was concerned about the applicant “receiving substandard medical care in Mexico during a high risk pregnancy.” The AAO notes that other than [REDACTED] statement, the record does not contain any medical documentation establishing that the applicant and her daughter suffer from any medical conditions. However, the AAO notes the applicant’s spouse’s concerns for the applicant’s and his daughter’s health.

The applicant’s husband states the applicant and his children are in Michoacán, Mexico, and it “is not a safe place.” The AAO notes that the record establishes that the applicant’s husband has been transferring money to the applicant in Michoacán, Mexico. The applicant’s husband also states he “get[s] nightmares when [he] imagine[s] [his] family and [him] living in that place. It is really affecting [him] emotionally.” The AAO notes that counsel submitted an article regarding how Michoacán is considered the center of Mexico’s methamphetamine production. Additionally, on August 27, 2010, the Department of State issued a travel warning to United States citizens thinking of traveling to Mexico. The AAO notes that this warning is primarily focused on northern Mexico, i.e., along the United States-Mexico border; however, the warning also states “[r]ecent violent attacks and persistent security concerns have prompted the U.S. Embassy to urge U.S. citizens to defer unnecessary travel to Michoacán...and to advise U.S. citizens residing or traveling in those areas to exercise extreme caution.... If travel in Michoacán is unavoidable, U.S. citizens should exercise extreme caution, especially outside major tourist areas.” The AAO notes that the situation in parts of Mexico, including the central state of Michoacán, has become unstable and unsafe for United States citizens.

Based on the travel warning issued to United States citizens, the applicant’s spouse’s lack of family and employment ties to Mexico, his concern for the applicant’s and his daughter’s medical conditions, and the emotional hardship of being separated from his family, the AAO finds that the applicant’s husband would suffer extreme hardship if he were to relocate to Mexico to be with the applicant.

Regarding the hardship the applicant’s husband would suffer if he were to remain in the United States without the applicant, the applicant’s husband states he does not make enough money to support two households, one in Mexico and one in the United States. He claims he is about to lose his home because he is two months behind on the mortgage payments, and he has to send money to Mexico. The AAO notes that the record establishes that the applicant’s husband sends money to the applicant in Mexico.

states the applicant's children's behavior has changed since they moved to Mexico and she indicates that they are suffering from separation anxiety. The applicant's husband states he has been treated for depression. diagnosed the applicant's husband with dysthymic disorder and acute stress disorder, and states that he is struggling with anxiety, depression, and insomnia. states the applicant's husband is the primary breadwinner in the family. However, the applicant's husband claims he "cannot work well anymore." He states he is a hardworking person but his "performance has not been too good recently. This situation is killing [him], [he] [does] [not] have the energy and [he] cannot concentrate." In a letter dated May 22, 2008, of Gorman Roofing Services, Inc., states the applicant's husband's "work is declining, and he seems very down and depressed. The past few months there has been a very noticeable decline in his customer service skills and just doesn't seem 'like himself.'" Based on the applicant's spouse's psychological issues, separation from his children, financial issues and employment problems, the AAO finds that the applicant's husband would experience extreme hardship if the applicant's waiver request were to be denied and he remained in the United States.

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).

The adverse factors in the present case are the applicant's initial entry without inspection and her period of unlawful presence for which she now seeks a waiver. The favorable and mitigating factors are the applicant's United States citizen husband and children, and the extreme hardship to her husband if she were refused admission.

The AAO finds that, although the immigration violations committed by the applicant are serious and cannot be condoned, when taken together, the favorable factors in the present case outweigh the adverse factors, such that a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. Accordingly, 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 remains entirely 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