

Identifying data deleted to
prevent identity information
invasion of personal privacy

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



PUBLIC COPY

#6

DATE: **DEC 15 2011** OFFICE: CIUDAD JUAREZ

FILE: [REDACTED]

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 PETITIONER:

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

Perry Rhew, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and 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 10 years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. Citizen spouse.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant failed to establish his qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship given the applicant's inadmissibility and denied the application accordingly. *See Decision of Field Office Director* dated July 20, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant, appearing without counsel, submits a statement on the Form I-290B, *Notice of Appeal or Motion*, as well as three affidavits. In the I-290B statement, the applicant emphasizes that his spouse would suffer from depression without him, and that his sick father-in-law needs the applicant to take care of him. *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion*, received August 13, 2009. The applicant additionally stresses the family bonds between him and the spouse. *Id.*

The record includes, but is not limited to, the documents listed above, other letters and affidavits, applications and petitions filed on the applicant's behalf, receipts, appointment notices and notes on prescription pads, and photographs. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9) 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.

(ii) Construction of unlawful presence.- For purposes of this paragraph, an alien is deemed to be unlawfully present in the United States if the alien is present in the United States after the expiration of the period of stay authorized by the Attorney General or is present in the United States without being admitted or paroled.

....

(v) Waiver.-The Attorney General 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 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. No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action by the Attorney General regarding a waiver under this clause.

The applicant admitted under oath that he entered the United States without inspection in 2004 and remained until February 2008 when he returned to Mexico. The applicant has therefore accrued more than one year of unlawful presence, and is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. The applicant's qualifying relative for a waiver in this case is his U.S. Citizen spouse.

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 states she is not only his spouse, “but the eventual mother of his child.” *Letter from applicant’s spouse*, August 5, 2009. She claims his relocation to Mexico is “what is preventing [her] from becoming pregnant” in addition to what a doctor has told her is “the stress that [she is] under.” *Id.* She additionally submits: “I went to see a doctor in Mexico (because I do not have health insurance in this country and cannot afford to pay for health care here).” *Id.* Psychologically, the applicant’s spouse indicates: “My happiness is gone and I cannot cope with the idea that my husband is not able to be with me. The doctor recommended antidepressants, but I don’t think that is the solution.” *Id.* Moreover, the applicant’s spouse states in another letter that it would be devastating for her if the applicant were not allowed to rejoin her in the United States, and she fears a recurrence of her past depression. *Letter from applicant’s spouse*, undated. Both the spouse’s father and brother confirm the spouse is sad and has been crying frequently. *See letter from* [REDACTED] August 7, 2008, *see also letter from* [REDACTED] August 5, 2009.

Regarding the spouse’s medical difficulties, there is a note in the file stating that the applicant’s spouse had an appointment in a medical office on April 4, 2008, as well as a prescription for Benadryl and ibuprofen. *See notes from* [REDACTED] April 4, 2008. [REDACTED] the applicant’s father-in-law, adds: “I do have Diabetes and I suffer of hypertension in both illness[es] the worst thing [that] can happen to me is anxiety and stress and that is what happened [to] me since [REDACTED] was retained in Mexico more than one year ago. After that my sugar [rose] and my [heart has] started to give me problems again.” *Letter from* [REDACTED] 2008. There are also additional documents in the record in Spanish. However, without a certified

English translation, the AAO cannot consider these documents on appeal pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b).¹

The record also contains a letter from the applicant's former employer, [REDACTED] worked for us for over two years and is eligible for re-hire. [REDACTED] always displayed great work ethic and was a valuable member of our team. [REDACTED] was on time and very professional during his time with us." *Letter from [REDACTED]* 2008. The applicant's income was not mentioned in the letter. Regarding financial difficulties, the applicant's spouse submits a copy of a receipt of a utility deposit for \$50.00, a receipt for payment of an electric bill in the amount of \$42.42, and a receipt for a \$30.00 medical office visit. *See receipts.*

Despite submission of these receipts, the record does not contain sufficient evidence of the spouse's or the applicant's household expenses to support assertions of financial hardship. The applicant further fails to provide any evidence regarding his own or his spouse's employment and earnings. Without details of the family's expenses and income, the AAO is unable to assess the nature and extent of financial hardship, if any, the applicant's spouse will face.

Moreover, although the spouse asserts she has some medical difficulties, there is no evidence of record describing what those difficulties actually are, the severity of the spouse's complete medical condition and how it affects her quality of life to allow an assessment of the spouse's medical needs and whether the applicant can assist with those needs. Absent an explanation in plain language from the treating physician of the exact nature and severity of any condition and a description of any treatment or family assistance needed, the AAO is not in the position to reach conclusions concerning the severity of a medical condition or the treatment needed, or the nature and extent of any hardship the applicant's spouse would suffer as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility.²

The applicant's spouse indicates she is sad, and may be depressed, due to the applicant's immigration problems and the resulting separation. *Letter from applicant's spouse, August 5, 2009.* Although the depth of concern and anxiety over the applicant's immigration status is neither doubted nor minimized, the fact remains that Congress provided for a waiver of inadmissibility only under limited circumstances. In nearly every qualifying relationship, whether between husband and wife or parent and child, there is a deep level of affection and a certain amount of emotional and social interdependence. While, in common parlance, the prospect of separation or involuntary relocation nearly always results in considerable hardship to individuals and families, in specifically limiting the availability of a waiver of inadmissibility to cases of "extreme hardship," Congress did not intend that a waiver be granted in every case where a qualifying relationship, and thus the familial and emotional bonds, exist. The point made in this and prior decisions on this matter is that the current state of the law, viewed from a legislative, administrative, or judicial point of view, requires that the

¹ 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b) states: "(3) Translations. Any document containing foreign language submitted to USCIS shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English."

² The spouse also does not indicate whether the lack of assistance from the applicant with her father's medical problems, which also lack supporting evidence creates a hardship for her.

hardship, which meets the standard in section 212(9)(B)(v) of the Act, be above and beyond the normal, expected hardship involved in such cases. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of removal are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991), *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996); *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996) (holding that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968) (holding that separation of family members and financial difficulties alone do not establish extreme hardship). “[O]nly in cases of great actual or prospective injury . . . will the bar be removed.” *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246 (BIA 1984). Further, demonstrated financial difficulties alone are generally insufficient to establish extreme hardship. *See INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981) (upholding BIA finding that economic detriment alone is insufficient to establish extreme hardship).

While the AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s spouse would face difficulties as a result of the applicant’s inadmissibility, we do not find evidence of record to demonstrate that her hardship would rise above the distress normally created when families are separated as a result of inadmissibility or removal. In that the record fails to provide sufficient evidence to establish the financial, medical, emotional or other impacts of separation on the applicant’s spouse are cumulatively above and beyond the hardships commonly experienced, the AAO cannot conclude that she would suffer extreme hardship if the waiver application is denied and the applicant remains in Mexico without his spouse.

Moreover, there is no indication in the record of whether the applicant’s spouse would experience extreme hardship if she relocated to Mexico. Without any assertions or supporting evidence, the AAO cannot conclude the applicant has met his burden of proof to show extreme hardship to his spouse upon relocation to Mexico.

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. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to his U.S. Citizen spouse as required under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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 a 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. 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.