


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: JUL 10 2012 Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO FILE: 

IN RE: Applicant: 

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

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.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

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 one year or more and seeking readmission within ten years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant's spouse is a U.S. citizen, one of her children is a lawful permanent resident and she seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and the application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated July 2, 2010.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse asserts that he would experience extreme hardship if the applicant is found to be inadmissible. *Applicant's Spouse's Statement*, dated July 23, 2010.

The record includes, but is not limited to, the applicant's spouse's statement, medical records for the applicant's spouse, a psychological evaluation of the applicant's spouse and financial records. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

The record reflects that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in July 2000 and she departed the United States in July 2009. The applicant accrued unlawful presence during this entire period of time. The applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of one year or more and seeking readmission within ten years of her July 2009 departure from the United States.

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

(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 [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.

A section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant or her child with legal status is not considered in section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to a qualifying relative, in this case the applicant's spouse. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (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 spouse states that he is concerned about finding accessible medical care and medications in Mexico; only Mexican citizens are entitled to receive low cost or free medical care; he has resided in the United States for over 35 years; he has three U.S. citizen children and three U.S. citizen grandchildren in the United States; he only knows the American way of life; he would not be able to re-adapt to life in Mexico; it is not realistic to assume that he can find employment at his age in Mexico; he would need to obtain work authorization in Mexico; young and able Mexican workers cannot find employment in Mexico and migrate to the United States; he will carry the stigma of having renounced his Mexican citizenship, speaking foreign-sounding Spanish and not being viewed as a true Mexican; and he has diabetes and related eye conditions.

The applicant’s spouse’s medical records reflect that he is being treated for proliferative diabetic retinopathy; his diabetes is causing severe changes in both eyes resulting in bleeding, swelling and decreased vision; and he will be receiving multiple laser treatments to help manage his eye disease. The record reflects that he is receiving care for diabetes, hypertension and hyperlipidemia and he is currently on many medications.

The record does not include supporting documentary evidence of the applicant’s spouse’s three children and his proximity to them. The record reflects that the applicant’s spouse is 59 years-old and has resided in the United States for a very lengthy period of time, thereby supporting his claim that re-adapting to life and finding employment in Mexico would be difficult. In addition, he has

several medical conditions and his eye condition appears to be severe in nature. Considering the hardship factors mentioned, and the normal results of relocation, the AAO finds that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he resided in Mexico.

The applicant's spouse states that his health has deteriorated upon learning he could be separated from the applicant; he is 58 years-old and separation for 9 years would mean the end of their relationship; he sought psychological help after being unable to sleep, suffering from nightmares and suffering from depression and anxiety; he has diabetes and an eye condition that has progressively gotten worse; he has had seven eye surgeries; he will suffer if the applicant is not able to take care of him; the applicant earned about half of the family income; he has been unable to keep up with the bills and has gone into debt; he is forced to send money to the applicant in Mexico; he would have to travel to Mexico frequently and this would jeopardize his employment; and it would be a hardship to see his stepsons lose the love and support of the applicant.

The psychologist who evaluated the applicant's spouse states that his stepson is living with the applicant in Mexico; he reported loss of energy, sleep disturbance, anxiety, depression, headaches, withdrawal and anhedonia; and the psychologist diagnosed him with Major Depressive Disorder and Generalized Anxiety Disorder. The applicant's 2008 Form W-2 reflects wages of \$28,960.79 and her spouse's Form W-2 reflects wages of \$21,285.76.

The record reflects that the applicant's spouse has several medical conditions and his eye condition appears to be severe in nature. In addition, he has significant emotional/psychological issues due to separation from the applicant. In regard to financial hardship, the AAO notes that the applicant earned more than half of the family income when she was in the United States. Considering the hardship factors mentioned, and the normal results of separation, the AAO finds that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he remained in the United States.

The AAO additionally finds that the applicant merits a waiver of inadmissibility as a matter of discretion. 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 section 212(h)(1)(B) 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-Moralez, 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 adverse factors in the present case are the applicant's entry without inspection, unauthorized employment and unlawful presence.

The favorable factors include the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse, lawful permanent resident child, extreme hardship to her spouse and the lack of a criminal record.

The AAO finds that the immigration violations committed by the applicant cannot be condoned. Nevertheless, the AAO finds that taken together, the favorable factors in the present case outweigh the adverse factors, such that a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained.

In proceedings for an application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In this case, the applicant has met her burden that she merits approval of her application.

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