

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



tl6

Date:

Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO

FILE: 

MAY 16 2011

IN RE: 

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

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,

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 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 admission within ten years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant was further found inadmissible under section 212(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I), as an alien classified as having a physical/mental disorder with associated behavior that may pose, or has posed, a threat to the property, safety or welfare of the alien or others. The applicant has a U.S. citizen spouse and three U.S. citizen step-children. He seeks waivers of inadmissibility pursuant to sections 212(a)(9)(B)(v) and 212(g) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(9)(B)(v) and 1182(g).

In a decision, dated September 5, 2008, the acting district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that his bar to admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, his United States citizen spouse, and denied the Application for Waiver of Ground of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly.

In a brief submitted on appeal, former counsel for the applicant states that the applicant's spouse has demonstrated that she has been experiencing extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's absence. The applicant's spouse submits additional documentation on appeal.

The record reflects that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I) of the Act as an alien classified as having a physical/mental disorder with associated behavior that may pose, or has posed, a threat to the property, safety or welfare of the alien or others.

Section 212(a) of the Act provides, 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 . . . is inadmissible.

(B) Waiver authorized.--For provision authorizing waiver of certain clauses of subparagraph (A), see subsection (g).

Section 212(g) of the Act provides, 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.

The record reflects that the panel physician who conducted the applicant's medical examination referred the applicant to a psychologist for an evaluation after he reported that he was arrested on two occasions for alcohol related offenses. The applicant was arrested in 1994 and in November 2005 in Alabama for driving under the influence of alcohol. The psychologist classified the applicant as having a Class A medical condition, Alcohol Abuse, with associated Harmful Behavior. The District Director found the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act on this basis.

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 USCIS 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 be forwarded to the U.S. Public Health Service for review. *Id.* These regulations further provide:

(ii) *Submission of statement.* Upon being notified that the medical report has been reviewed by the U.S. Public Health Service and determined to be acceptable, the alien or the alien's sponsoring family member shall submit a statement to the consular or [USCIS] office. The statement must be from a clinic, hospital, institution, specialized facility, or specialist in the United States approved by the U.S. Public Health Service. The alien or alien's sponsor may be referred to the mental retardation or mental health agency of the state of proposed residence for guidance in selecting a post-arrival medical examining authority who will complete the evaluation and provide an evaluation report to the Centers for Disease Control. The statement must specify the name and address of the specialized facility, or specialist, and must affirm that:

(A) The specified facility or specialist agrees to evaluate the alien's mental status and prepare a complete report of the findings of such evaluation.

(B) The alien, the alien's sponsoring family member, or another responsible person has made complete financial arrangements for payment of any charges that may be incurred after arrival for studies, care, training and service;

(C) [REDACTED] shall be furnished:

(1) The report evaluating the alien's mental status within 30 days after the alien's arrival; and

(2) Prompt notification of the alien's failure to report to the facility or specialist within 30 days after being notified by the U.S. Public Health Service that the alien has arrived in the United States.

(D) The alien shall be in an outpatient, inpatient, study, or other specified status as determined by the responsible local physician or specialist during the initial evaluation.

The record reflects that the applicant meets the requirements for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(g) of the Act. The record contains a Centers for Disease Control (CDC) form 4,422-1, Statements in Support of Application for Waiver of Inadmissibility. Part I of CDC form 4,422-1 reflects that the Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service (PHS) received the required medical documentation regarding the applicant's present condition. The PHS reviewing official, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], classified the applicant as having a Class A medical condition, Alcohol Abuse, which renders him inadmissible under section 212(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I). Part II of CDC form 4,422-1 shows that, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(b)(4)(ii), the applicant obtained the required statement from [REDACTED]. The applicant's wife completed Part III of Form CDC 4,422-1, attesting that necessary arrangements for further examination of the applicant will be made upon his entry to the United States. On August 21, 2007, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] approved the applicant's Form CDC 4,422-1, thus certifying PHS's opinion that appropriate follow-up care will be provided upon the applicant's entry to the United States, and that PHS has no objection to his entry. Therefore, the AAO finds that the applicant has established eligibility for a waiver of the ground of inadmissibility arising under section 212(g) of the Act pertaining to aliens who have been classified as having a Class A medical condition.

The record also indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in November 1988. The applicant remained in the United States until April 2007. Therefore, the applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date the unlawful presence provisions were enacted, until April 2007. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of his April 2007 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 being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(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.

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. Hardship to the applicant or his children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's spouse 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-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 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 record of hardship includes: a brief, copies of medical bills for the applicant's stepson, four letters from community members attesting to the applicant's moral character, a letter from the applicant's landlord in Alabama, a copy of a "letter to the editor" of a local newspaper stating that the applicant returned a stranger's wallet, a psychological evaluation for the applicant's spouse and stepchildren, bank account statements and other financial documentation, copies of the applicant's marriage certificate, and the birth certificates of his three stepchildren.

In a brief, received on November 3, 2008, the applicant's former counsel states that the applicant and his spouse have been married seven years and share the responsibility of caring for three children, ages nine to twelve, who have been abandoned by their biological fathers who do not visit with them or pay child support. Counsel states that the applicant plays the role of father figure for these children and provides for them. Counsel states further that as a result of the applicant's departure two years ago the family's finances have diminished, the children no longer have medical insurance and now rely on Medicaid, and the whole family is suffering from depression.

In a psychological evaluation, dated September 28, 2008, a [REDACTED] states that he evaluated the applicant's spouse and two stepchildren on September 27, 2008 to determine the effect the applicant's two year absence is having on these family members. [REDACTED] found that the applicant's family is devastated by the applicant's absence and that they are not only struggling financially, but they are also lacking the daily support and encouragement of the applicant. He states that their days are much more stressful and uncertain and recommends that the applicant be returned to his family as soon as possible.

The AAO notes that the record includes numerous medical bills for the applicant's stepson for the year 2004 which shows that the applicant's stepson had numerous procedures and tests done. These bills indicate that the applicant's stepson had medical insurance through his mother during this time. In addition, the record includes a 2002 federal tax return showing that the applicant and his spouse earned approximately \$31,000 during that tax year.

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. As stated above, the applicant must show that his qualifying relative will suffer extreme hardship as a result of separation and as a result of relocation. The AAO notes that the record is silent as to the applicant's spouse's ability to relocate to Mexico to be with the applicant. Furthermore, the current record does

not indicate that the applicant's spouse is suffering hardship that rises to the level of extreme. The documentation does not provide a complete picture as to the applicant's spouse's financial situation before the applicant left the United States as compared to after the applicant's departure. In addition, the emotional hardship described by [REDACTED] does not rise to the level of extreme, but reflects hardship common to spouses separated as a consequence of removal and/or inadmissibility. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

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.