

**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**



*H/6*

Date: **SEP 09 2011**

Office: MEXICO CITY (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,

*Maria Feh*

*f/*

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Acting District Director, Mexico City, 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 establishes that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who entered the United States without authorization in July 1990 and did not depart the United States until December 2004. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the effective date of the unlawful presence provisions of the Act, until his departure in December 2004. The applicant was thus 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. The applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility. Rather, he seeks a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), to reside in the United States with his lawful permanent resident spouse.

The acting district 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 Ground of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Acting District Director*, dated October 27, 2008.

In support of the appeal, counsel for the applicant submits the following *inter alia*: a brief, dated November 24, 2008; an affidavit from the applicant's spouse, dated November 24, 2008; evidence of the applicant's spouse's lawful permanent resident status; documentation of the applicant's and his spouse's marriage in 1965; evidence of the U.S. citizenship or lawful permanent resident status of the applicant's children and grandchildren; an affidavit from the applicant's daughter-in-law, dated November 25, 2008; family photographs; medical documentation pertaining to the applicant's spouse; information about country conditions in Mexico; and financial documentation. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) 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. Hardship to the applicant can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's lawful permanent resident 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-Moralez*, 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 lawful permanent resident spouse contends that she will suffer emotional, medical and financial hardship were she to remain in the United States while the applicant resides abroad due to his inadmissibility. In a declaration, the applicant’s spouse explains that she and her husband, who are in their 60s, have been married for over 46 years and were her husband to remain abroad, she would suffer emotional hardship due to long-term separation. She further explains that the thought that her husband would not be allowed to reside in the United States due to his inadmissibility is causing her high levels of stress, hypertension, headaches, insomnia, anxiety and poor concentration. Finally, the applicant’s spouse contends that due to her husband’s relocation abroad and the loss of his income working for [REDACTED] she has moved in with her U.S. citizen son and daughter-in-law and is dependent on them for financial support. *Affidavit of [REDACTED]* dated November 25, 2008.

In support, a letter has been provided from the applicant's daughter-in-law, [REDACTED] confirming that the applicant’s spouse has moved in with her and her family and is financially dependent on them as the applicant is residing in Mexico. [REDACTED] further attests to the emotional hardship the applicant’s spouse is experiencing due to long-term separation from her husband. *Declaration of [REDACTED]* dated November 25, 2008. In addition, a medical letter has been provided confirming the applicant's spouse’s numerous medical conditions and the medications prescribed to her. See *Letter from [REDACTED]*

dated November 7, 2008. Finally, evidence establishing the applicant's financial contributions to the household prior to departing the United States has been submitted in the form of tax returns and W-2 Forms.

The record establishes that the applicant and his spouse have been married since 1965. They are both over 60 years old. They had a total of thirteen children together. In addition, the record establishes that prior to his departure from the United States, the applicant was gainfully employed and the sole provider of the household but since his departure, his wife has had to move in with her U.S. citizen son and his family as she is unable to support herself financially. A prolonged separation at this time would cause hardship beyond that normally expected of one facing the removal of a spouse. Thus, based on a thorough review of the record, and in particular considering the length of the marriage between the applicant and his spouse and the additional emotional hardship separation brings about, the AAO concludes that were the applicant unable to reside in the United States, the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship.

With respect to relocating abroad to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility, the applicant's spouse contends that she would suffer emotional hardship due to long-term separation from her children and grandchildren. In addition, the applicant's spouse references the problematic country conditions in Mexico, including poverty and political and criminal unrest. *Supra* at 3.

The record indicates that many members of the applicant's spouse's family reside in the United States, including children and grandchildren. Moreover, as referenced by the applicant's spouse and documented by counsel, 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. *Travel Warning-Mexico, U.S. Department of State*, dated April 22, 2011. Finally, the U.S. Department of State confirms the applicant's spouse's statements regarding the problematic economic conditions in Mexico.<sup>1</sup>

The record reflects that the applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse would have to readjust to a country with which she is no longer familiar. She would have to leave her children and grandchildren, her community, and the medical professionals familiar with her conditions and treatment plan, and she would have safety concerns in Mexico. In addition, she would not be able to

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

maintain her quality of living due to the substandard economy in Mexico. It has thus been established that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship were she to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has established that his lawful permanent resident 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 he 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).

See *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). The AAO must then, "[B]alance 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 lawful permanent resident spouse and U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident children and grandchildren would face if the applicant were to remain in Mexico, regardless of whether they accompanied the applicant or remained in the United States, the long and stable marriage between the applicant and his spouse, the applicant's community ties, the applicant's apparent lack of a criminal record, the payment of taxes and the applicant's gainful employment in the United States. The unfavorable factors in this matter

are the applicant's entry to the United States without authorization and unlawful presence and unauthorized employment 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 his 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 application approved.

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