

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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



H6

DATE: Office: CIUDAD JUAREZ, MEXICO FILE: [REDACTED]

DEC 08 2011
IN RE:

Applicant: [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:

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, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. 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 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's spouse and mother are U.S. citizens. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and the application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated January 12, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant refers to medical records and statements from relatives which support her claim of extreme hardship. *Form I-290B*, dated February 4, 2009.

The record includes, but is not limited to, the applicant's spouse's statements, a physician's letter, medical records for the applicant and her spouse, information on Meniere's disease, the applicant's mother's statement, and statements from other relatives. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

The record reflects that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in October 2003 and departed the United States in November 2007. The applicant accrued unlawful presence during this entire period of time. The applicant is 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 and seeking readmission within ten years of her November 2007 departure from the United States.

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.

A section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant is not considered in section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to a qualifying relative, in this case the applicant's spouse and mother. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (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 applicant’s spouse’s physician states that the applicant’s spouse has been in the United States for a considerable period of time; he has worked for the same company for the past 27 years; and he has been able to support his family. *Letter from [REDACTED] M.D.*, dated January 22, 2009. However, the AAO notes that the record does not contain any evidence regarding the applicant’s spouse’s employment. The applicant’s spouse states that the applicant has Meniere’s disease and has been seeing a doctor in Mexico. *Applicant’s Spouse’s First Statement*, undated. The applicant’s spouse states that the applicant would not be able to continue her medical treatment for her ear problem. *Applicant’s Spouse’s Second Statement*, undated. The applicant’s medical records reflect that she has Meniere’s disease. The record does not include evidence that the applicant could not receive treatment in Mexico. The AAO notes that going on record without supporting documentation will not meet the applicant’s burden of proof in this proceeding. *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)). The record lacks sufficient documentary evidence of emotional, financial, medical or other types of hardship that, in their totality, establish that the applicant’s spouse or mother would suffer extreme hardship if they were to relocate to Mexico. The AAO notes that the applicant does not assert extreme hardship to a qualifying relative upon relocation to Mexico.

The applicant’s spouse states that the applicant had been taking care of her ailing U.S. citizen mother. *Applicant’s Spouse’s Second Statement*, undated. Although the record includes a November 6, 2007 letter from the applicant’s mother referring to the assistance she needs from the applicant and that she has health problems, the record is not clear as to the severity of her health problems or if there is another sibling who could assist her.

The applicant's spouse states that he had an ideal life when the applicant was living in the United States; he provided for the applicant and their child; his family was happy and close; he has considered taking his own life due the applicant's absence; his daughter has run away from home and blames him for the loneliness and frustration that she is feeling; he spent five days in a mental health hospital due to what is happening to his family; and he is taking medication for depression and high blood pressure. *Applicant's Spouse's Third Statement*, dated February 3, 2009. The applicant's spouse's physician states that the applicant's spouse has been hospitalized due to severe depression, suicidality, anxiety and insomnia; these problems stem from the applicant not being with him in the United States; his daughter has been depressed about the matter and has fled the home; and his daughter blames him. *Letter from [REDACTED] M.D.* The applicant's spouse's medical records reflect diagnoses of depression, alcohol dependence, elevated blood pressure and insomnia; and he was prescribed an anxiety/insomnia medication. *Medical Records*, dated January 20, 2009. The record reflects that the applicant's spouse was admitted to a mental health center and includes a list of two medications. *Kaiser Permanente Admission Records*, dated January 21-22, 2009. The record includes letters from the applicant's spouse's family members detailing the emotional hardship that he and his daughter are experiencing. The applicant's spouse's daughter also details her closeness to the applicant. *Applicant's Spouse's Daughter's Letter*, dated November 25, 2007.

Considering the unique factors presented, including the applicant's spouse's psychiatric issues, issues with his daughter and the normal results of separation from a spouse, the AAO finds that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he remained in the United States. The record does not reflect that the applicant's mother would suffer extreme hardship if she remained in the United States.

Although the applicant has demonstrated that her spouse would experience extreme hardship if separated from the applicant, we can find extreme hardship warranting a waiver of inadmissibility only where an applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the scenario of separation *and* the scenario of relocation. 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 remain in the United States and thereby suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of separation can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no intention to separate in reality. *See Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to separate and suffer extreme hardship, where relocating abroad with the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, *see also Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship from relocation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to her spouse in this case. The record does not reflect that the applicant's mother would suffer extreme hardship in either scenario. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she 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

██████████
Page 6

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.