

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: **DEC 11 2012**

Office: MEXICO CITY




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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

for

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record establishes that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who entered the United States without authorization in January 2007 and did not depart the United States until September 2010. 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, she seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her lawful permanent resident spouse and U.S. citizen child, born in 2007.

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 Ground of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated June 11, 2011.

In support of the appeal, counsel for the applicant submits the following: a brief; letters from the applicant and her spouse; medical documentation pertaining to the applicant and her family; financial documentation; letters in support from the applicant's spouse's parents and siblings; and country conditions 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. The applicant's lawful permanent resident 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 lawful permanent resident spouse contends that he will suffer extreme emotional, physical and financial hardship were he to continue to reside in the United States while the applicant remains abroad due to her inadmissibility. To begin, the applicant’s spouse declares that his wife is his reason for living and he misses her very much. He notes that he is depressed, he sometimes loses his concentration at work and he has lost ten pounds as a result of the stress and loneliness he is feeling due to long-term separation from his wife. He further explains that his son is residing with the applicant in Mexico because he cannot care for him in the United States, thereby causing the applicant’s spouse hardship. In addition, the applicant’s spouse notes that although he is gainfully employed in the United States, he has been helping support his wife in Mexico and that is causing him financial hardship as he is unable to afford to continue to maintain two households on his income. Further, the applicant’s spouse details that to be closer to his wife, he has moved from Georgia to Texas. He notes that he is now away from his parents, his siblings, his friends, his home, and the town where he has lived for over 12 years, making him feel very alone. Finally, the applicant’s spouse expresses fear for his wife and child due to the high rates of crime and violence and the problematic economy in Mexico. As a result of his fears and anxieties, he references that he has been diagnosed with high blood pressure. *Letter and Translation from Jaime Gonzalez*, dated July 9, 2011. In a separate statement, the applicant contends that her son is showing signs of depression as a result of long-term separation from his father. *Letter and Translation from Maria de la Luz Juarez Turrubiarres*, dated July 9, 2011.

With respect to the emotional hardship referenced, counsel has submitted documentation establishing that the applicant’s spouse has been diagnosed with depression and has been prescribed

an antidepressant. Documentation has also been provided establishing that the applicant's child is showing symptoms of depression due to separation from his father. Further, evidence has been provided establishing money transfers to Mexico to help support the applicant financially. Further, letters in support have been provided from family members noting the hardships the applicant's spouse is experiencing as a result of his wife's inadmissibility. Finally, the AAO notes that the U.S. Department of State has issued a Travel Warning for Mexico, and in particular, San Luis Potosi, the applicant's birth place, due to cartel violence and highway lawlessness. *Travel Warning-Mexico, U.S. Department of State*, dated February 8, 2012.

The record reflects that the cumulative effect of the emotional, physical and financial hardship the applicant's spouse is experiencing 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.

Extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must also be established in the event that he or she accompanies the applicant abroad based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. To begin, the applicant's spouse explains that he became a lawful permanent resident almost twelve years ago and no longer has ties to Mexico. Moreover, the applicant's spouse details that he is gainfully employed and were he to relocate abroad, he would not be able to obtain gainful employment. In addition, the applicant's spouse references the high rate of crime and violence in Mexico. Further, the applicant's spouse details that his family, including his parents and four siblings, reside in the United States and long-term separation from them would cause him hardship. *Letter from Jaime Gonzalez Vazquez*, dated November 21, 2010.

In support, counsel has provided numerous articles about the problematic country conditions in Mexico. In addition, evidence of the applicant's spouse's gainful employment in the United States has been provided. Moreover, evidence of the applicant's spouse's home ownership in the United States has been submitted. Further, letters from the applicant's parents and two siblings have been submitted, outlining the hardship the applicant's spouse would experience were he to relocate to Mexico. Finally, as noted above, the U.S. Department of State has issued a Travel Warning for Mexico, and in particular, San Luis Potosi, the applicant's birth place. 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.

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 hardships the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse and child would face if the applicant were to remain abroad, regardless of whether they accompanied the applicant or remained in the United States, community ties, support letters, and the apparent lack of a criminal record. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's entry without authorization 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 application approved.

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