

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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



PUBLIC COPY

HG



Date: MAY 06 2011


Office: TEGUCIGALPA, HONDURAS

FILE:

IN RE: Applicant:

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:



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, Tegucigalpa, Honduras, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Honduras 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 is married to a United States citizen and the mother of two United States citizen children. She 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 her spouse and children.

The Field Office 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 Field Office Director*, dated December 15, 2008.

On appeal, counsel states the applicant's husband is suffering psychological hardship in being separated from the applicant and is seeking psychological treatment. *Counsel's letter*, dated July 23, 2010.

The record includes, but is not limited to, counsel's letter, counsel's brief in support of the I-601, declarations from the applicant's husband, and psychological reports for the applicant's husband. 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 record indicates that the applicant entered the United States in November 1995 without inspection. In October 2006, the applicant departed the United States.

The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the effective date of the unlawful presence provisions under the Act, until October 2006, when she departed the United States. The applicant is seeking admission into the United States within ten years of her October 2006 departure. The applicant is, therefore, 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.

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 her children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's husband 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 United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 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 (Board) 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 a qualifying relative, 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 first prong of the analysis addresses hardship to the applicant’s spouse if he relocates to Honduras. In a psychological report dated December 28, 2008, [REDACTED] reports that the applicant’s husband could move to Honduras but “he doesn’t see this as a realistic plan.” [REDACTED] states the applicant’s husband is worried “that he would not be able to get a job there, [he] can’t speak Spanish, [and] [he] doesn’t feel he could function.” In a psychological report dated January 2, 2009, [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant’s husband does not have medical insurance in Honduras and he believes his son¹ would have a better future in the United States. [REDACTED] diagnosed the applicant’s husband with adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depression, and recommended that he attend therapy. The AAO notes the claims made regarding the difficulties the applicant’s husband would face in relocating to Honduras.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s husband is a citizen of the United States and that he may experience some hardship in residing in Honduras. The AAO notes that other than the above mentioned psychological reports, the record fails to contain documentary evidence, e.g., country conditions reports on Honduras, that demonstrate that the applicant’s husband would be unable to obtain employment upon relocation that would allow him to use the skills he has acquired in the United States. Going on record without supporting documentation is not sufficient to 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

¹ The AAO notes that the applicant’s son’s birth certificate does not list a father.

I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Additionally, the AAO notes that the applicant's husband may be suffering from some mental health issues; however, there is no documentation in the record establishing that he cannot attend therapy in Honduras or that he has to remain in the United States to receive therapy. The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's son may suffer some hardship; however, the AAO finds that the applicant has not shown that hardship to her son will elevate her husband's challenges to an extreme level. Further, the AAO notes that the record fails to demonstrate that the applicant's husband has any medical condition that would affect his ability to relocate or that he would experience any other form of hardship in Honduras. In that the record does not include sufficient documentation of financial, medical, emotional or other types of hardship that the applicant's husband would experience if he joined the applicant in Honduras, the AAO does not find the applicant to have established that her husband would suffer extreme hardship upon relocation.

In addition, the record does not establish extreme hardship to the applicant's husband if he remains in the United States. In an undated declaration, the applicant's husband states that if the applicant is not "allowed to return this would cause extreme heartache and pain." Counsel claims that the applicant's husband is suffering psychological hardship in being separated from the applicant and he has been seeking treatment since 2008. The AAO notes that psychological reports in the record indicate that the applicant's husband sought treatment for his mental health issues on December 29, 2008 and January 2, 2009. Additionally, as noted above, the applicant's husband was diagnosed with adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depression. [REDACTED] reports that the applicant's husband "has been drinking heavily," is not "sleeping well," is not as productive at work, has headaches, is tearful, and has not been eating well. In a declaration dated February 4, 2008, the applicant's husband states "[i]t would be difficult for [him] to function if [the applicant] is refused admission. [He] would not be able to concentrate on anything else other than [the applicant]." The AAO notes the applicant's husband's mental health concerns.

In counsel's brief in support of the I-601 dated February 6, 2007, counsel states the applicant's husband supports his family by working "as a utilities maintenance person at BP." [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant's husband bought a house in August 2007, "and the financial strain is difficult. He has to pay for the mortgage here, and pay for [the applicant and his children] in Honduras as well." The AAO notes the applicant's husband's financial concerns.

The applicant's husband states it would be bad for him and the children if the applicant remains in Honduras. Counsel claims that the applicant and her husband have a strong bond and "[t]he family enjoy[s] recreational activities." The applicant's husband states he "became [the applicant's] daughter's father figure." Counsel states the applicant's husband "shares a great relationship with his stepdaughter." Counsel also states extreme psychological and emotional hardship is being caused by having the applicant's children reside in Honduras. Counsel claims that being separated from the applicant is destroying "the strong familial bond that [the applicant's husband's] children have been able to establish with him and [the applicant]." The applicant's husband states they should raise their children together. Counsel claims that the applicant's husband "would not be able to provide for his children" if they are separated. The AAO notes the concerns for the applicant's children and husband.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's husband may be suffering some emotional problems; however, the submitted psychological reports do not establish that his emotional hardships go beyond the typical effects of separation. Additionally, the AAO notes that the applicant's husband may be experiencing some financial hardship; however, the applicant failed to submit any documentation establishing that her husband is unable to support himself in her absence. Further, the AAO notes that the applicant has submitted no evidence to establish that she is unable to obtain employment in Honduras and, thereby, reduce the financial burden on her husband. In that the record does not include sufficient documentation of financial, medical, or other types of hardship that the applicant's husband would experience, the AAO finds that the applicant failed to establish that her husband would suffer extreme hardship if her waiver application is denied and he remains in the United States.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. 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)(v) 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.