

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H6



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: **SEP 23 2010**

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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.

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, with a fee of \$585. 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 District Director, Mexico City, Mexico, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

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. The applicant is the spouse of a citizen of the United States. The applicant sought a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), so as to immigrate to the United States. The director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that his bar to admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. The applicant filed a timely appeal.

Counsel states on appeal that the applicant's spouse is in financial straits and cannot pay her household expenses. She declares that the applicant's spouse has borrowed \$10,000 from family members, has had her water turned off, and will have her house foreclosed. Counsel indicates that the applicant's spouse obtained Medicaid Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), and food stamp benefits in order to feed her children. Counsel contends that [REDACTED] professional opinion is that the applicant's spouse will have an adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depression if she is separated from her husband or is forced to move to Mexico, where she does not speak the language and is unfamiliar with the culture.

Although not explicitly addressed by the district director, we note that the record reflects that on January 11, 2001, the applicant was convicted of "solicit for prostitution" in violation of General Statutes of North Carolina § 14-204(5), a class A misdemeanor, for which he paid a fine and costs. North Carolina law provides that the maximum penalty possible for a misdemeanor is 150 days imprisonment.¹ We need not determine whether "solicit for prostitution" is a crime involving moral turpitude, which would render the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act, because his conviction qualifies for the petty offense exception under section 212(a)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act.

The AAO will now address the finding of inadmissibility. Inadmissibility for unlawful presence is found under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act. That section provides, in part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

¹ See General Statutes of North Carolina § 14-3, and the misdemeanor punishment grid located at <http://www.nccourts.org/Courts/CRS/Councils/spac/Documents/misdemeanorpunishmentchart.pdf>.

- (I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, voluntarily departed the United States . . . and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, or
- (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.

....

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records reflect that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in July 1998 and remained in the country until his departure on November 28, 2006. The applicant would have begun to accrue unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date on which the unlawful presence provisions went into effect, until November 28, 2006, when he left the country and triggered the ten-year bar, rendering him inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

The waiver for unlawful presence is found under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. That section provides that:

- (v) Waiver. – The Attorney General [now Secretary, 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.

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 can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's U.S. citizen wife is the only qualifying relative in this case. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, USCIS then assesses whether an 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 are possible 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 to be taken is difficult, and it 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 (the 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*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-66 (BIA 1999), the Board provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 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).

In rendering this decision, the AAO will consider all of the evidence in the record including copies of birth certificates, a marriage certificate, letters, medical documentation, Medicaid identification cards, WIC records, invoices, and other documentation.

With regard to the applicant’s wife remaining in the United States without her husband, the applicant’s wife states in her psychological evaluation dated September 4, 2007, that she has a close relationship with her husband and considers him as “saving her.” She conveys that she “ran with a wild crowd” and was raped twice before she was 16 years old. She states that her parents divorced when she was 14 years old, and that she was sent back and forth between her father in Ohio and her mother in North Carolina until she was 16 years old, when she settled in Charlotte, North Carolina. She indicates that she worked from the time she was 15 years old, and had earned her Graduate Equivalency Degree (GED) when she was 17 years old. She declares that she married the applicant on June 6, 2002, and that they have two children who were born on October 28, 2005 and August 8, 2007. She states that her husband financially supported the family while she took care of their daughter and that she has been struggling since he left the country. She conveys that the hardest thing for her to cope with is how much her daughter misses her father. The record reflects that the applicant’s spouse receives WIC and Medicaid benefits for her children.

Family separation 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 type of familial 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 otherwise 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 familial relationship involved, the hardship resulting from family separation is 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. Indeed, the specific facts of a case may dictate that even the separation of a spouse and children from an applicant does not constitute extreme hardship. In *Matter of Ngai*, for instance, the Board did not find extreme hardship because the claims of hardship conflicted with evidence in the record and because the applicant and his spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years. 19 I&N Dec. at 247. 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 hardship factors asserted in the instant case, and demonstrated by the evidence in the record, are the emotional and financial impact to the applicant’s wife as a result of separation from her husband, particularly because it concerns her two minor children. In view of the substantial weight that is given to this type of family separation in the hardship analysis, and in light of the significant effect that the record establishes that separation from the applicant will have on the applicant’s wife, we find the applicant has demonstrated that the hardship that his wife will experience as a result of separation is extreme.

The applicant’s spouse states to the psychologist that if she joined her husband to live in Mexico, she will not know its language and will leave behind all she knows in the United States. She indicates in an undated letter that she is concerned that the health of her children will suffer in Mexico and she described how her daughter, who weighed 24 pounds, lost 4 pounds because of a parasite that she acquired while in Mexico. The record contains a letter from [REDACTED] dated August 30, 2007 wherein she states that the applicant’s daughter had been very sick and was treated for gastroenteritis when she returned from Mexico. The applicant’s spouse conveys that she is worried that her children will have to give up the good medical care they now receive, and she expresses concern about their receiving an inferior education in Mexico and returning to the United States without knowledge of the English language. She further states that moving to Mexico will separate her from her mother and all of her husband’s family members, who are in the United States (except for his grandmother). The psychologist avers that all of the applicant’s spouse’s prolonged and chronic losses will have deleterious effects on her mental health.

The asserted hardships to the applicant's spouse are the emotional separation that she will experience as a result of separation from all of her family members in the United States; living in a country where she does not know the language and culture; having concern about the health of her children and the availability of healthcare that is comparable to what they now receive; and having anxiety about her children receiving their education in Mexico and not being able to transition to schooling in the United States. In view of the background of the trauma the applicant's wife endured when she was 16 years old, we find that when all of the hardship factors are combined, particularly the emotional support that the applicant's wife receives from her parents and relatives in the United States, they demonstrate extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse if she joined her husband to live in Mexico.

In *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996), the Board stated that once eligibility for a waiver is established, it is one of the favorable factors to be considered in determining whether the Secretary should exercise discretion in favor of the waiver. Furthermore, the Board stated that:

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).

Id. at 301.

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 adverse factors in the present case are the unlawful presence and unauthorized employment, and the criminal conviction for “solicit prostitution.” The favorable factors in the present case are the extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse and children; the letters by the applicant's in-laws, wife, relatives, and friends attesting to his good character. The AAO finds that the immigration violations committed by the applicant are serious in nature; nevertheless, when taken together, we find 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(h) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility rests with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act. Here, the applicant has now met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained and the waiver application will be approved.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.