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 10 2011

IN RE: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Sections 212(g) and 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(g) and 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)

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.

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,

for Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Acting District Director, Mexico City, 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 inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)(A)(iii), as an alien classified as having a mental disorder and behavior associated with the disorder that may pose, or has posed, a threat to the property, safety or welfare of the alien or others. The applicant was also found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of 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 his last departure from the United States. The applicant is the spouse of a United States citizen. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his wife.

In a decision dated September 29, 2008, the Acting District Director found that the applicant failed to establish that his qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of his inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Acting District Director* dated September 29, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant's qualifying relative provided an affidavit. In her affidavit, the qualifying spouse detailed the hardships that she is facing as a result of her separation from the applicant. She asserts that she is encountering medical, financial, personal and emotional hardships due to the applicant's absence.

The record contains an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130), an Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601), a Notice of Appeal (Form I-290B), an affidavit from the qualifying spouse, a picture of the medication taken by the qualifying spouse, an article regarding high blood pressure from the [redacted], documentation of credit card bills and other expenses, a letter from the qualifying spouse in Spanish, a handwritten note from a doctor regarding the qualifying spouse, two reference letters and a deed to a property in the qualifying spouse's name.

Section 212(a) states, in pertinent part:

> (a) Classes of Aliens Ineligible for Visas or Admission.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, aliens who are inadmissible under the following paragraphs are ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States:
>
> (1) Health-related grounds.—
>
> (A) In general.-Any alien-
>
> . . .
>
> (iii) who is determined (in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health

> and Human Services in consultation with the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security])—
>
> > (I) to have a physical or mental disorder and behavior associated with the disorder that may pose, or has posed, a threat to the property, safety, or welfare of the alien or others, or
> >
> > (II) to have had a physical or mental disorder and a history of behavior associated with the disorder, which behavior has posed a threat to the property, safety, or welfare of the alien or others and which behavior is likely to recur or to lead to other harmful behavior . . . is inadmissible.
>
> (B) Waiver authorized.—For provision authorizing waiver of certain clauses of subparagraph (A), see subsection (g).

8 U.S.C. § 1182(a). The Acting District Director based the finding of inadmissibility under this section on the Department of State's Medical Examination for Immigrant or Refugee Applicant's diagnosis of the Class A Condition. Consultation with the Department of Human Services Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), as required by statute, resulted in the classification of the applicant as "Class A" and inadmissible. The medical examination revealed that "the likelihood of alcohol-related harmful behavior recurrence is considered to be still present."

Section 212(g) reads, in pertinent part:

> (g) The Attorney General may waive the application of—
>
> > (3) subsection (a)(1)(A)(iii) in the case of any alien, in accordance with such terms, conditions, and controls, if any, including the giving of bond, as the [Secretary], in the discretion of the [Secretary] after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may by regulation prescribe.

8 U.S.C. § 1182(g). Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(b) govern aliens with certain mental conditions, who are eligible for immigrant visas but require the approval of waivers of grounds of inadmissibility. The regulations require that the applicant submit the waiver application and a statement to the appropriate Service office indicating that arrangements have been made to provide the alien's complete medical history, including details of any hospitalization or institutional care or treatment for any physical or mental condition; the alien's current physical and mental condition, including prognosis and

life expectancy; and a psychiatric examination. 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(b)(4). "For an alien with a past history of mental illness, the medical report shall also contain available information on which the U.S. Public Health Service can base a finding as to whether the alien has been free of such mental illness for a period of time sufficient in the light of such history to demonstrate recovery." *Id.* The medical report must then forwarded to the U.S. Public Health Service for review. *Id.*

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.

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. 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. *See Matter of Mendez-Moralez,* 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 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." *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 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).

Family separation, for instance, 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 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.

The applicant's qualifying relative in this case is his wife, who is a United States citizen.

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in May 2000, and remained until November 2002 when he voluntarily departed. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from May 2000 until November 2002, a period in excess of one year. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of his departure from the United States. The applicant has not disputed his inadmissibility based upon this ground. Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

A waiver of the bar to admission under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes extreme hardship on a qualifying relative of the applicant. The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's wife must be established in the event that she relocates to Mexico and in the event that she remains in the United States, as she is not required to reside outside the United States based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. The AAO will consider the relevant factors in adjudication of this case.

The documentation submitted relating to the potential hardships facing the applicant's spouse was an affidavit from the qualifying spouse, a picture of the medication taken by the qualifying spouse, an article regarding high blood pressure from the [redacted] documentation of credit card bills and other expenses, a handwritten note from a doctor regarding the qualifying spouse, two reference letters and a deed to a property in the qualifying spouse's name. Although the applicant also provided a letter from the qualifying spouse in Spanish, the requisite translation was not provided. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(3) states:

> (3) Translations. Any document containing foreign language submitted to the Service [now Citizenship and Immigration Services] 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.

As such, the letter from the qualifying spouse written in Spanish, without a translation, cannot be considered in analyzing this case.

As previously stated, the applicant's qualifying relative provided an affidavit detailing the hardships that she is facing as a result of her separation from the applicant. She asserts that she is encountering medical, financial, personal and emotional hardships due to the applicant's absence.

Although the qualifying spouse's separation from the applicant may be causing her emotional and financial hardships, there is very little evidence in the record to demonstrate the hardships that she may be encountering. The record contains the qualifying spouse's affidavit, which indicates that she

is experiencing fear, sadness and anxiety as a result of her separation from the applicant. However, assertions cannot be given great weight absent supporting evidence. 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)). Moreover, the applicant's spouse asserts that the applicant had been financially responsible for "almost all of the expenses in [their] home." She explains that now she is working two jobs and finding it difficult to keep up with her expenses and her mortgage. In addition to the qualifying spouse's affidavit, the record contains documentation of the qualifying spouse's expenses and of the deed to her home. However, no documentation relating to the applicant's spouse's income or the income of the applicant prior to his departure was provided. The applicant has failed to support the assertions by his qualifying spouse regarding her financial difficulties because the record does not contain any evidence regarding her employment and/or the prior employment of the applicant. *Id.* at 165.

Moreover, the applicant's spouse contends that she is suffering from high blood pressure, and that if her condition worsens she could "suffer a heart attack." The record contains a picture of the bottle of medication she is taking and a handwritten note from her doctor that indicates she "has a history of hypertension and hyperlipidemia." The applicant also provided general information regarding high blood pressure from the [redacted] However, the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish the severity of the qualifying spouse's condition. 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. As such, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that his spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a result of his inadmissibility.

The AAO likewise finds that the applicant has not met his burden of showing that his spouse would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to Mexico. The record contains no documentation regarding country conditions in Mexico, particularly in the location where the applicant and his spouse would likely reside. If the applicant's spouse relocated to Mexico, she would no longer experience the emotional hardships associated with separation or bear the financial obligation of supporting herself alone. The applicant claimed that she knows little Spanish, has no family ties to Mexico and is from Guatemala. However, the applicant has not addressed whether he has family ties in Mexico, and the AAO is thus unable to ascertain whether and to what the extent he would receive assistance from family members for both himself and his spouse. The applicant has also not addressed whether the qualifying spouse has any family to the United States. Even if the AAO were to take notice of general conditions in Mexico, the record lacks evidence demonstrating how the applicant's spouse would be affected specifically by any adverse conditions there. The current record does not establish that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship upon relocating to Mexico.

In sum, although the record indicates that the applicant's wife may be encountering hardships based on separation, it does not support a finding that the difficulties, considered in the aggregate, would rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. *See Perez,* 96 F.3d at 392; *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. at 631. Although the distress caused by

separation from one's spouse is not in question, a waiver of inadmissibility is only available where the resulting hardship would be unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon removal. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to his spouse, as required for a waiver of inadmissibility 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 or whether he meets the requirements for a waiver under section 212(g) of the Act.

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.