

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

FEB 23 2011

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Date:

IN RE: [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:

[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,

f.
Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Chicago, Illinois. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained and the waiver application will be approved.

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 again seeking admission within ten years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant is the spouse of a United States citizen. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her husband.

In a decision dated June 20, 2008, the District 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 District Director* dated June 20, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant's attorney provided a brief detailing the hardships that the qualifying spouse would encounter as a result of his separation from the applicant. The attorney asserts that the qualifying spouse would suffer emotional, psychological, medical and financial hardships.

The record contains the original Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601), the Notice of Appeal (Form I-290B), an appeal brief, a letter from a doctor, reference letters recommending the applicant, a psychosocial assessment, an affidavit from the applicant, a letter from the billing department of the qualifying spouse's health care provider, some of his medical records, and financial information included with the Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485). 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:

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 her husband, who is a United States citizen.

The record indicates that the applicant first entered the United States with a Border Crossing Card on November 11, 1995 and left on or about February 18, 1999. The applicant reentered the United States with her Border Crossing Card on February 25, 1999 and has remained since that date. As such, the applicant has accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of the enactment of the unlawful presence provisions, until February 18, 1999, 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. Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(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 husband must be established in the event that he relocates to Mexico and in the event that he remains in the United States, as he 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 applicant's qualifying relative is her husband and the Petition For Alien Relative (Form I-130) has already been approved.

The documentation provided which specifically relates to the qualifying spouse's hardship includes a letter from a doctor, a psychosocial assessment, an affidavit from the applicant, a letter from the billing department of the qualifying spouse's health care provider and some of his medical records and financial information included with Form I-485. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

As aforementioned, the applicant's attorney asserts that the qualifying spouse would suffer emotional, psychological, medical and financial hardships should he remain in the United States with the applicant or relocate to Mexico.

The AAO finds that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of being separated from the applicant. The applicant's attorney asserts that he would face emotional, psychological, medical and financial hardships if he were to remain in the United States without the applicant. With regard to any potential emotional and psychological hardships, the record contains a psychosocial assessment which explains the past abuse that the qualifying spouse endured in Mexico, his abandonment issues and the problems in his family that have led him to isolate himself from them and others. As a result, if he were to remain in the United States without the applicant, the assessment indicates that his isolation would be "extreme." The applicant's attorney also indicates that the qualifying spouse has health issues including high blood pressure and gout. The record contains a letter from a doctor, various medical records and a letter from a medical billing department confirming that he has these conditions and that the applicant "takes care of him." However, the documentation failed to demonstrate the severity of his medical issues or whether the assistance of the applicant is necessary. The applicant's attorney also contends that the applicant's spouse would suffer a financial hardship should the applicant return to Mexico because she contributes financially through her employment and also because she assists her husband in managing and maintaining their rental property. The record contains financial documentation supporting these assertions. As such, the applicant provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that her qualifying spouse would suffer extreme hardship should he remain in the United States without the applicant.

The applicant has also demonstrated that her qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship in the event that he relocated to Mexico. The applicant's attorney explains that if the qualifying spouse were to relocate to Mexico, he would have to leave without his son who lives with his ex-wife and would be unable to visit him. Moreover, the psychosocial assessment indicates that he desperately wants his child to go to college, since he never had enough money to go himself, and also wants to be able to continue to pay for his child support because his ex-wife relies on his money. The assessment further explains that if his son is unable to go to college because he relocates to Mexico, he will suffer severe depression as he is "invested in being a good father to his son because he felt rejected by his own father, who was an alcoholic." The divorce decree and settlement terms, submitted with the Form I-485, confirm the qualifying spouse's child support responsibilities. The record also contains wage and earnings statements showing that the applicant's spouse is presently employed and able to pay child support. The applicant's attorney also asserts that the applicant's spouse could face safety concerns in Mexico, but provides no documentary support to substantiate such claims. Nonetheless, the AAO concludes that were the

applicant unable to reside in the United States due to her inadmissibility, her qualifying spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he returned to Mexico with her.

Considered in the aggregate, the applicant has established that her husband would face extreme hardship if the applicant's waiver request is denied.

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 [REDACTED]*, the BIA, assessing the exercise of discretion under section 212(h) of the Act, stated:

We find this use of *Matter of Marin, supra*, 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 *Matter of Marin, supra*, 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] at 300.

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). . . .

Id. at 301.

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 must bring forward to establish that she 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. *Id.* at 301.

The favorable factors in this matter are the extreme hardships the applicant's United States citizen spouse would face if the applicant is not granted this waiver, regardless of whether he accompanied the applicant or remained in the United States, the applicant's ties to the United States, as documented by letters in support of the waiver application, and her apparent lack of a criminal record. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's accrual of unlawful presence in the United States.

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 her burden and the appeal will be sustained.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.