


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



#6

Date: DEC 07 2011

Office: TEGUCIGALPA

FILE: 

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 \$630. 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, Tegucigalpa, Honduras. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Honduras 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 her last departure from the United States. The applicant is married to a United States citizen. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her spouse and children.

In a decision dated June 23, 2009, the Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish that her qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of her inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director* dated June 23, 2009.

On appeal, the qualifying spouse provided a letters detailing his hardships. In the qualifying spouse's letter, he asserts that he is suffering from emotional and psychological hardships as a result of his separation from the applicant. Further, the qualifying spouse indicates that he has lived in the United States for over twenty years and that he would be unable to find employment in Honduras. He also states that he needs his current job in the United States to pay for his own medical expenses and diabetes medicine, as well as to support his father in Honduras. In addition, he states that there are high crime rates in Honduras.

The record contains Biographic Information (Form G-325A) regarding the applicant and the qualifying spouse, an Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601), a Notice of Appeal (Form I-290B), letters from the applicant and qualifying spouse, copies of the applicant's employment authorization cards, a copy of the applicant's social security card, a letter from the qualifying spouse's doctor, proof of money sent to the qualifying spouse's father, financial documentation, a divorce document regarding the qualifying spouse's first marriage, country condition materials, letters from the qualifying spouse and applicant's daughters, proof of one of the daughter's enrollment and expenses in college and a letter from the qualifying spouse's brother. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering 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-

....

(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.

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.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides:

- (1) The [Secretary] may, in the discretion of the [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, 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 the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an 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 child 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).

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 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. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996); *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 883 (BIA 1994); *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.*

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., Matter of 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). For example, though family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal, separation from family living in the United States can also be the most important single hardship factor in considering hardship in the aggregate. *See Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *but see Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247 (separation of spouse and children from applicant not extreme hardship due to conflicting evidence in the record and because applicant and spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years). Therefore, we consider the totality of the circumstances in determining whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection on October 2, 1992 and voluntarily departed on September 15, 2008. The applicant was granted Temporary Protected Status (TPS) from September 8, 1999 until January 5, 2009. As such, the applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the effective date of the unlawful presence provisions of the Act, until September 8, 1999, the date the applicant was granted TPS, a period in excess of one year. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of her departure from the United States. The applicant has not disputed her inadmissibility. Therefore,

as a result of the applicant's unlawful presence, she is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

The documentation submitted relating to the potential hardships facing the applicant's spouse includes Form I-601, Form I-290B, Form G-325A regarding the applicant and the qualifying spouse, letters from the applicant and qualifying spouse, a letter from the qualifying spouse's doctor, proof of money sent to the qualifying spouse's father, financial documentation, country condition materials, letters from the qualifying spouse and applicant's daughters, proof of one of the daughter's enrollment and expenses in college and a letter from the qualifying spouse's brother. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

The AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that her qualifying spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of being separated from her. The applicant's spouse indicates that he is experiencing emotional hardships, as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility. In his letter, he indicates that he feels lonely and depressed. Further, the letters from the applicant and their children also confirm that the qualifying spouse is stressed and depressed without the applicant. However, these letters fail to provide detail explaining how the qualifying spouse's emotional and psychological hardships are outside the ordinary consequences of removal. Further, other than the letters provided by the qualifying spouse, applicant and their children, there is no documentation to demonstrate the actual emotional and/or psychological hardships that the qualifying spouse is encountering. Assertions are evidence and will be considered. However, going on record without supporting documentary evidence generally is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *See Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). As such, the applicant failed to provide sufficient documentation regarding the qualifying spouse's emotional and psychological hardships to demonstrate that he is suffering extreme hardship as a consequence of separation.

However, the applicant has demonstrated that her qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship in the event that he relocated to Honduras with the applicant. The qualifying spouse has been living in the United States for over twenty years. The qualifying spouse's children and brother live and have lawful status in the United States. Further, the record reveals that the qualifying spouse has been financially supporting his father and at least one of his children. As a result, the qualifying spouse asserts that he relies on his job to support these family members and to pay for his own medications for diabetes. According to the Form G-325A, the applicant's spouse has been employed by the same company for almost ten years. The record also contains a letter from the qualifying spouse's doctor confirming that he is being treated for diabetes and is taking medications for his condition. The record contains tax returns indicating that one of his children is named as his dependent and also contains proof that he is sending money to his father in Honduras. Further, the qualifying spouse indicates that he would have a difficult time finding employment in Honduras and that he also has safety concerns regarding relocation to Honduras. The record contains various country condition materials that address some of these concerns. The AAO therefore concludes that, were the applicant's spouse to relocate to Honduras with the applicant, he would suffer extreme

hardship due to his length of residence in the United States, ties to the United States and the effects of relocation to Honduras.

Although the applicant has demonstrated that the qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship if he relocated abroad to reside with the applicant, we can find extreme hardship warranting a waiver of inadmissibility only where an applicant has shown extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the scenario of relocation *and* the scenario of separation. The AAO has long interpreted the waiver provisions of the Act to require a showing of extreme hardship in both possible scenarios, as a claim that a qualifying relative will relocate and thereby suffer extreme hardship can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no actual intention to relocate. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to relocate and suffer extreme hardship, where remaining in the United States and being separated from the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, also *cf. Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship from separation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the qualifying relative in this case.

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that the hardships faced by the qualifying relative, considered in the aggregate, rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship if she remains in the United States without the applicant. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to his qualifying spouse as required under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act. As the applicant has not established extreme hardship to a qualifying family member, no purpose would be served in determining whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) 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.