

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



DATE: **OCT 18 2011**

Office: CIUDAD JUAREZ

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.

Thank you,


Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained. The waiver application will be approved.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who entered the United States without authorization in June 2003 and did not depart the United States until December 2007. The applicant was thus 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. The applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility. Rather, she seeks a waiver of inadmissibility under 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 U.S. citizen spouse.

The field office director concluded 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 June 10, 2009.

In support of the appeal, counsel for the applicant submits the following *inter alia*: a brief, dated August 10, 2009; a declaration from the applicant's spouse; a psychological evaluation pertaining to the applicant's spouse; a declaration from the applicant; affidavits from the applicant's spouse's family members and evidence of their legal status in the United States; a letter from the applicant's child; photographs of the family; medical documentation pertaining to the applicant and her spouse; a letter from the applicant's spouse's employer; and financial documentation. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

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

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 Attorney General (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...

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 U.S. citizen spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. Hardship to the applicant or her child can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. 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).

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 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. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996); *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 883 (BIA 1994); *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.*

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., *Matter of 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). For example, though family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal, separation from family living in the United States can also be the most important single hardship factor in considering hardship in the aggregate. See *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); but see *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247 (separation of spouse and children from applicant not extreme hardship due to conflicting evidence in the record and because applicant and spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years). Therefore, we consider the totality of the circumstances in determining whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

The applicant’s U.S. citizen spouse asserts that he will suffer emotional and financial hardship were he to reside in the United States while the applicant remained abroad due to her inadmissibility. In a declaration he contends that he is suffering emotional hardship due to long-term separation from his spouse. He states that his wife is the center of his universe and is everything to him and without her, he feels incomplete. The applicant’s spouse further explains that his child is residing in Mexico with his mother due to the applicant’s spouse’s work obligations and such an arrangement is causing the applicant’s spouse hardship. Finally, the applicant’s spouse references that he is maintaining two households, one in the United States and one in Mexico, and such an arrangement is causing him hardship. He asserts that he has had to put off saving for his son’s education, for the family’s future and for family emergencies. *Declaration from* [REDACTED] dated August 2, 2009.

In support, an evaluation has been provided from [REDACTED] concludes that the applicant’s spouse is suffering from symptoms consistent with Major Depressive Disorder and Generalized Anxiety Disorder as a result of his wife’s inadmissibility. [REDACTED] further outlines the hardships the applicant’s child will experience due to long-term separation from his father. *Letter from R* [REDACTED] *Psychotherapist*, dated July 11, 2009. In addition, documentation of medications prescribed to the applicant to treat his depression and insomnia have been provided.

In addition, a letter has been provided from the applicant’s spouse’s employer, [REDACTED] confirming that the applicant’s spouse was devastated when his wife relocated abroad. He notes that since his wife’s departure, the applicant’s spouse has lost weight and the stress of the situation is bearing down on him. *Letter from* [REDACTED]

dated April 14, 2008. Moreover, letters have been provided from the applicant's spouse's family members, including his mother, outlining the hardships the applicant's spouse is experiencing due to his wife's inadmissibility. Further, counsel has submitted evidence establishing the financial contributions the applicant's spouse is making to his wife's household in Mexico. Finally, the AAO notes that the U.S. Department of State has issued a Travel Warning for Mexico, and in particular, Chihuahua, where the applicant and her child currently reside. The travel warning advises U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents of the high rates of crime and violence in Mexico. As noted by the U.S. Department of State,

You should be especially aware of safety and security concerns when visiting the northern border states of [REDACTED]. Much of the country's narcotics-related violence has occurred in the border region. More than a third of all U.S. citizens killed in Mexico in 2010 whose deaths were reported to the U.S. government were killed in the border cities of [REDACTED]. Narcotics-related homicide rates in the border states of Nuevo Leon and Tamaulipas have increased dramatically in the past two years.

Travel Warning-Mexico, U.S. Department of State, dated April 22, 2011.

The record reflects that the cumulative effect of the emotional and financial hardship the applicant's spouse would experience due to the applicant's inadmissibility rises to the level of extreme. The AAO thus concludes that were the applicant unable to reside in the United States due to her inadmissibility, the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he remains in the United States.

The applicant's U.S. citizen spouse asserts that he does not want to relocate to Mexico because he would suffer as a result of long-term separation from his elderly mother and nine siblings. He explains that he sees his siblings frequently at family gatherings, holidays and visits to their home and further, he helps support his mother financially. In addition, the applicant's spouse contends that were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant, he would lose the career that he has worked so hard to build. He notes that it took him many years as a laborer to gain the footing he needed to work as a foreman and secure a full-time position in the building trade, but were he to move to Mexico, he would have to give up his career. Finally, the applicant's spouse contends that he would be in severe economic straits and it will be difficult to find gainful employment to support himself and his family. *Supra* at 8-10.

The record reflects that the applicant's spouse came to the United States in 1986 and became a U.S. citizen almost five years ago. Were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant, he would have to leave his extended family, his church, his community and his long-term gainful employment. Moreover, the applicant's spouse would not be able to maintain his quality of living due to the

substandard economy in Mexico.¹ Finally, as noted above, the U.S. Department of State has issued a travel warning, advising U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents of the high rates of crime and violence in Mexico, including the applicant's home state of Chihuahua. It has thus been established that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to her inadmissibility.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has established that her U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship were the applicant unable to reside in the United States. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the situation presented in this application rises to the level of extreme hardship. However, the grant or denial of the waiver does not turn only on the issue of the meaning of "extreme hardship." It also hinges on the discretion of the Secretary and pursuant to such terms, conditions and procedures as she may by regulations prescribe. In discretionary matters, the alien bears the burden of proving eligibility in terms of equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. *See Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957).

In evaluating whether . . . relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the factors adverse to the alien 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 and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of the 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 alien began 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 or service in 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).

¹ As noted by the U.S. Department of State,

Poverty is widespread (around 44% of the population lives below the poverty line) and high rates of economic growth are needed to create legitimate economic opportunities for new entrants to the work force. The Mexican economy in 2009 experienced its deepest recession since the 1930s. Gross domestic product (GDP) contracted by 6.5%, driven by weaker exports to the United States; lower remittances and investment from abroad; a decline in oil revenues; and the impact of H1N1 influenza on tourism.

See Matter of Mendez-Morales, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). The AAO must then "balance the adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented on the alien's behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of the country." *Id.* at 300. (Citations omitted).

The favorable factors in this matter are the extreme hardship the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse and child would face if the applicant were to remain in Mexico, regardless of whether they accompanied the applicant or stayed in the United States, church membership, home ownership, certificates issued to the applicant for completing English language courses, the applicant's apparent lack of a criminal record, support letters from the applicant's spouse's family and employer, the payment of taxes, and community ties. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's unauthorized entry to the United States and unlawful presence while in the United States.

The immigration violations committed by the applicant are serious in nature and cannot be condoned. Nonetheless, the AAO finds that the applicant has established that the favorable factors in her application outweigh the unfavorable factors. Therefore, a favorable exercise of the Secretary's discretion is warranted.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has sustained that burden. Accordingly, this appeal will be sustained and the I-601 waiver application approved.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The waiver application is approved.