

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

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO

Date: **FEB 01 2011**

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:

[Redacted]

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,

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 his last departure from the United States. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a United States citizen and 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 his United States citizen wife and children.

The Acting District Director found that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Acting District Director*, dated September 10, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant through counsel asserts that the denial of the applicant's waiver application would result in extreme hardship to his family. *See Form I-290B*, dated September 30, 2008 and the accompanying letter from counsel, dated October 26, 2008.

The record includes, but is not limited to, declarations from the applicant's wife, dated September 7, 2007 and October 9, 2007, a letter from counsel dated October 26, 2008, a copy of a Psychological Evaluation Report from [REDACTED] regarding the applicant's spouse, copies of several bills, copies of The State of California Benefits Identification Cards in the name of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], and a letter from [REDACTED] president of [REDACTED], dated October 3, 2007, stating that the applicant has been employed by the company since July 2000. The entire record was reviewed and considered 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-
  - ....
  - (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 applicant claims that he entered the United States in February 1995 without being inspected and admitted or paroled. On June 17, 2005, the applicant's United States citizen spouse filed a Form I-130 on the applicant's behalf. On April 21, 2006, the Form I-130 was approved. In August 2007, the applicant voluntarily departed the United States. On August 29, 2007, the Consular Officer in Mexico City, Mexico, found the applicant inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act and refused to issue him an immigrant visa. On September 13, 2007, the applicant filed a Form I-601 waiver. On September 10, 2008, the Acting District Director denied the Form I-601, finding that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the effective date of the Unlawful Presence provision under the Act until August 2007, when he voluntarily departed the United States. The applicant's unlawful presence for more than one year and departure from the United States triggered the ten-year bar in section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. Thus, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

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 children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's wife 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.

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 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." [REDACTED], 10 I&N Dec. 448, 451 (BIA 1964). In [REDACTED], 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. [REDACTED] 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. [REDACTED] 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.

In this case, the record reflects that the applicant’s spouse, [REDACTED] is a [REDACTED] old native of Mexico and citizen of the United States. The applicant and her husband were married on October 1, 2003, in Santa Ana, California, and they have two children. The applicant’s spouse states that she is suffering extreme emotional, financial and physical hardship as a result of family separation and the denial of the applicant’s waiver request.

Regarding the emotional, financial and physical hardships of separation, the applicant’s wife submitted declarations detailing the emotional and financial hardships she and her children are undergoing as a result of the applicant’s inadmissibility. The applicant’s wife states that she needs the applicant to help raise their children. In her declarations, the applicant’s wife states that since the denial of the applicant’s

waiver, her health has deteriorated because of the stress of taking care of their two children, and struggling to meet their financial obligations without the applicant's help. The applicant's wife states that her net monthly income of [REDACTED] is insufficient to pay their monthly bills of [REDACTED] which does not include additional expenses for their second child. She states that as a result of her financial hardship, she has had to borrow money from friends and relatives to "make ends meet" and that she and her children have moved in with her parents in order to save money. She also states that the family had medical insurance through the applicant's employer, which they lost when the applicant left for Mexico, and that she had to apply for health coverage for her and her older son from the State of California, and state assistance for her younger child. The applicant's wife states that the living arrangement with her parents has caused her and her children great stress, that her older son, [REDACTED], has developed behavioral problems, and that she is stressed by the whole environment. *See Declarations from [REDACTED] dated September 7, 2007 and October 9, 2007.*

The record contains a Psychological Evaluation Report from [REDACTED] dated September 29, 2008. [REDACTED] states that the applicant's wife suffers from Adjustment Disorder with Mixed Anxiety and Depressed Mood and Insomnia related to anxiety and depression due to separation from the applicant and the fact that she is left to care for herself and her children without the applicant's emotional and financial support. *See Psychological Evaluation Report – Immigration, by [REDACTED] dated September 29, 2008.* [REDACTED] concludes that not allowing the applicant to immigrate to the United States "will compromise the future, psychological, social and physical well-being of [the applicant's wife] and her two children." *Id.* The record also contains a letter from the applicant's employer, ACE Tube Bending, dated October 3, 2007, stating that the applicant has been employed by the company since 2000.

A preponderance of the relevant evidence in this case, demonstrates that the applicant's wife would face extreme hardship if the applicant's waiver petition is denied and she remained in the United States. Based on the detailed declarations from the applicant's wife, and the report from [REDACTED], the applicant has demonstrated that the financial and emotional hardships his wife faces, cumulatively rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship.

The AAO notes that extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must also be established in the event that he or she relocates abroad based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. With respect to this criteria, the applicant's wife states that she has been residing in the United States for a very long time, all her family members are here in the United States, and that she has no family ties in Mexico except the applicant. The applicant's wife further states that she and the applicant are originally from Michoacán, Mexico, an area that has become very dangerous due to high activity of the drug cartels, that they will have difficulty finding good and consistent employment that will support their family, and that she will be concerned for her and her children's safety, education and overall wellbeing in Mexico. *See Declarations from [REDACTED], dated September 7, 2007 and October 9, 2007.*

The AAO notes that the United States Department of State has issued a travel alert for Mexico. As noted by the U.S. Department of State:

Although the greatest increase in violence has occurred on the Mexican side of the U.S. border, U.S. citizens traveling throughout Mexico should exercise caution in unfamiliar areas and be aware of their surroundings at all times. Bystanders have been injured or killed in violent attacks in cities across the country, demonstrating the heightened risk of violence in public places. In recent years, dozens of U.S. citizens living in Mexico have been kidnapped and most of their cases remain unsolved.

The state of Michoacán is home to another of Mexico's drug-trafficking organizations [REDACTED]. In June 2010, 14 federal police were killed in an ambush near Zitacuaro in the southeastern corner of the state. In April 2010, the Secretary for Public Safety for Michoacán was shot in a DTO ambush. U.S. citizens should defer unnecessary travel to the area. If travel in Michoacán is unavoidable, U.S. citizen should exercise extreme caution, especially outside major tourist areas.

*Travel Warning – Mexico, U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, dated September 10, 2010.*

The record reflects that the applicant's husband is from [REDACTED] and the applicant's wife will have to reside in this area if forced to relocate to Mexico to live with the applicant. The emotional hardship when combined with the financial hardship and the difficulty of readjusting to the conditions in Mexico after a prolonged period of absence, would amount to extreme hardship to the applicant's wife if she relocated to Mexico to be with the applicant. Based on the totality of the evidence, it has been established that the applicant's wife would suffer extreme hardship if she relocates to Mexico to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in the aggregate, demonstrates that the applicant has established that his United States citizen wife would suffer extreme hardship if the applicant's waiver request is denied. Here, the entire range of factors considered in the aggregate takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation or inadmissibility, and supports a finding of extreme hardship.

Extreme hardship is a requirement for eligibility, but once established it is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). For waivers of inadmissibility, the burden is on the applicant to establish that a grant of a waiver of inadmissibility is warranted in the exercise of discretion. *Id.* at 299. The adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident must be balanced with the social and humane considerations presented on his behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of this country. *Id.* at 300.

The AAO notes that *Matter of Marin*, 16 I & N Dec. 581 (BIA 1978), involving a section 212(c) waiver, is used in waiver cases as guidance for balancing favorable and unfavorable factors and this cross application of standards is supported by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). In *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, the BIA, assessing the exercise of discretion under section 212(h) of the Act, stated:

We find this use of *Matter of* [REDACTED] as a general guide to be appropriate. For the most part, it is prudent to avoid cross application, as between different types of relief, of particular principles or standards for the exercise of discretion. *Id.* However, our reference to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is only for the purpose of the approach taken in that case regarding the balancing of favorable and unfavorable factors within the context of the relief being sought under section 212(h)(1)(B) of the Act. *See, e.g., Palmer v. INS*, 4 F.3d 482 (7th Cir.1993) (balancing of discretionary factors under section 212(h)). We find this guidance to be helpful and applicable, given that both forms of relief address the question of whether aliens with criminal records should be admitted to the United States and allowed to reside in this country permanently.

[REDACTED]

In *Matter of* [REDACTED] in evaluating whether section 212(h)(1)(B) relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the BIA stated that:

The factors adverse to the applicant 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, recency and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of an 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 the alien began his 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 and service to 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). . . .

[REDACTED]

The BIA further states that upon review of the record as a whole, a balancing of the equities and adverse matters must be made to determine whether discretion should be favorably exercised. The equities that the applicant for section 212(h)(1)(B) relief must bring forward to establish that he merits a favorable exercise of administrative discretion will depend in each case on the nature and circumstances of the ground of exclusion sought to be waived and on the presence of any additional adverse matters, and as the negative factors grow more serious, it becomes incumbent upon the applicant to introduce additional offsetting favorable evidence. [REDACTED]

The negative factors in this case are the applicant's prior entry in the United States without inspection and his unlawful presence in the United States. The positive factors in this case include the extreme hardship the applicant's United States citizen wife and children face if the waiver is denied, his long term employment in the United States and his apparent lack of criminal convictions.

Although the applicant's violations of immigration law cannot be condoned, the positive factors in this case outweigh the negative factors. In these proceedings, the burden of establishing eligibility for the waiver rests entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In this case, the applicant has met his burden and the appeal will be sustained.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained.