


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
Office of Administrative Appeals
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090
**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**




H6

DATE: **AUG 02 2012** OFFICE: NEW DELHI, INDIA FILE:

IN RE:

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to 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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to 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, New Delhi, India, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant, who is a native and citizen of Pakistan, was found inadmissible under 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 one year or more and seeking readmission within 10 years of his last departure from the United States. 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 his U.S. citizen spouse.

In a decision dated January 20, 2010, the Field Office Director concluded that the applicant did not meet his burden of proof to illustrate that his U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship and the application for a waiver of inadmissibility was denied accordingly.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant states that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse will suffer from extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility.

In support of the waiver application, the record includes, but is not limited to legal arguments by counsel for the applicant, letters from the applicant's spouse, a mental health assessment of the applicant's spouse, a letter and progress notes regarding the applicant's spouse's mental health counseling, copies of prescriptions for the applicant's spouse's medications, documentation of financial support sent to the applicant, telephone records for the applicant's spouse, biographical information for the applicant, biographical information for the applicant's spouse, letters of support from family and community members, and documentation concerning the applicant's immigration history.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act provides:

(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 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 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. No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action by the Attorney General regarding a waiver under this clause.

The applicant states that he entered the United States without inspection in October 2000 and remained in the United States until his departure at his own expense in March 2007. Accordingly, the record demonstrates that the applicant accrued one year or more of unlawful presence and is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for a period of 10 years from his departure from the United States. The applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility on appeal.

The applicant is eligible to apply for a waiver of this ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, as the spouse of a U.S. citizen. In order to qualify for this waiver, however, he must first prove that the refusal of his admission to the United States would result in extreme hardship to his spouse. 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 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. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996); *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 885 (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.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant’s spouse is suffering from extreme hardship as a result of the applicant’s inadmissibility. In particular, counsel states that due to separation from the applicant, the applicant’s spouse’s depression and anxiety have worsened. The applicant’s spouse also states that she is suffering from financial hardship as a result of the applicant’s absence. The record contains various letters from the applicant’s spouse and members of her family that state that the applicant and his spouse resided together beginning in 2000, the year that the applicant entered the United States without inspection. The AAO notes that the applicant and his spouse were not married until August 18, 2008 when the applicant’s spouse states that she visited the applicant in Pakistan after his departure from the United States. There is no evidence in the record of the applicant’s spouse’s income when he resided in the United States or the financial contribution that the applicant made to the household prior to his departure. As such, the record does not establish the role that the applicant’s inadmissibility has played in any financial hardship suffered by the applicant’s spouse. Based on the lack of evidence in the record, it is not possible to determine the degree of hardship suffered by the applicant’s spouse as a result of her separation

from the applicant. Additionally, although the record contains evidence of significant financial support sent from the applicant's spouse to the applicant in Pakistan, there is no indication in the record that this has caused financial hardship to the applicant's spouse. The record does not contain evidence of the applicant's spouse's income, expenses, or her inability to meet those expenses. Although the applicant's assertions are relevant and have been taken into consideration, little weight can be afforded them in the absence of supporting evidence. *See Matter of Kwan*, 14 I&N Dec. 175 (BIA 1972) ("Information in an affidavit should not be disregarded simply because it appears to be hearsay; in administrative proceedings, that fact merely affects the weight to be afforded it."). Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Without supporting evidence, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the applicant's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *See Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 n.2 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1, 3 n.2 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). In regards to the emotional hardship suffered by the applicant's spouse, the record makes clear that the applicant's spouse has sought medical treatment and counseling for anxiety and sleep disorders. A psychoemotional and marital dynamic assessment completed by [REDACTED] conducted in the applicant's spouse's native language of Spanish, states that the applicant's spouse is suffering from Adjustment Disorder with Mixed Anxiety and Depressed Mood. The record also indicates that the applicant's spouse undergoes bi-weekly individual counseling and takes medication for anxiety and insomnia. According to the progress notes submitted, it appears from the record that the applicant's spouse was benefiting from her treatment plan. There is no indication that her day to day functioning was limited by her emotional hardship. Although the AAO notes the applicant's spouse's difficult situation and recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of long-term separation from the applicant, the record does not establish that the hardships she would face, considered in the aggregate, rise to the level of "extreme."

In regards to the hardship that the applicant's spouse would suffer if she were to relocate to reside with the applicant in Pakistan, counsel for the applicant states that the applicant faces cultural and financial hardship that results in extreme hardship. The record establishes that the applicant's spouse is a native of the Dominican Republic who became a naturalized U.S. citizen in 1997. The AAO also takes note of the country conditions in Pakistan set forth in the Travel Warning issued by the U.S. Department of State on February 2, 2012. Counsel for the applicant; however, has not submitted any supporting evidence in regards to the hardship that the applicant's spouse would suffer in Pakistan. Notably, as well, the applicant's spouse states that she visited Pakistan in August 2008; however, there is no evidence in the record of any hardship that she suffered there. She states that she was received with flowers by the applicant's family at the airport and was very happy being with her husband there. The AAO notes the applicant's spouse's past history of abuse and her close relationship with her mother and adult son in the United States, but the extent of her contact with those individuals was not documented in the record and no explanation was given for why she would not be able to maintain contact with her family in the United States were she to relocate to Pakistan during the applicant's period of inadmissibility. The applicant's spouse states that she would suffer from financial hardship in Pakistan; however, there is no evidence in

the record of the applicant's spouse's current financial situation and her inability to obtain employment in Pakistan. Based on the evidence of record, considered in the aggregate, it is not possible to make a determination that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship, if she were to relocate to reside with her husband. *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381 at 383.

Although the applicant's spouse's concern over the applicant's immigration status is neither doubted nor minimized, the fact remains that Congress provided for a waiver of inadmissibility only under limited circumstances. In nearly every qualifying relationship, whether between husband and wife or parent and child, there is a deep level of affection and a certain amount of emotional and social interdependence. While, in common parlance, the prospect of separation or involuntary relocation nearly always results in considerable hardship to individuals and families, in specifically limiting the availability of a waiver of inadmissibility to cases of "extreme hardship," Congress did not intend that a waiver be granted in every case where a qualifying relationship, and thus the familial and emotional bonds, exist. The point made in this and prior decisions on this matter is that the current state of the law, viewed from a legislative, administrative, or judicial point of view, requires that the hardship, which meets the standard in section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, be above and beyond the normal, expected hardship involved in such cases.

Considered in the aggregate, the hardship to the applicant's spouse does not rise to the level of extreme beyond the common results of removal. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991); *Perez*, 96 F.3d at 392 (defining "extreme hardship" as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation); *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. at 631. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative as required under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. 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 an 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. 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.