

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 13 2012** Office: PANAMA CITY 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:



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 in accordance with the instructions on 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

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 contends that he will suffer emotional and financial hardship were he to remain in the United States while the applicant resides abroad due to her inadmissibility. In a declaration, the applicant’s spouse explains that he is experiencing anxiety as a result of his wife’s residence abroad and is currently taking over the counter medication to calm the anxiety. He asserts that his wife is the person he wants to spend the rest of his life with. The applicant’s spouse further maintains that he has spent a substantial amount of money on prepaid calling cards and trips to Colombia to maintain a relationship with his wife and were she to reside in the United States, he would be able to save money once again in order to be able to buy a nice house and live a good life. *Personal Statement from [REDACTED]*, dated February 7, 2009. On appeal, counsel notes that the applicant’s child is currently living with her father in the United States and during this time, the child has become ill and thus, the applicant’s spouse needs his wife in the United States so she can help care for their child while he concentrates more of his energy and attention on his business. *Letter from Jose Luis Aguirre, Esq.*, dated October 25, 2011.

In support of the emotional hardship referenced, a Social Worker Report and Update have been provided by [REDACTED]: [REDACTED] notes that the applicant’s spouse is experiencing hardship as a result of long-term separation from his wife. The reports provided are insufficient to establish that the applicant’s spouse is experiencing emotional hardship beyond others who are in the same situation. Moreover, although medical documentation has been provided establishing that the applicant’s child was in the hospital on [REDACTED] for a cold and was prescribed medication, it has not been established that the applicant’s child is experiencing hardship as a result of her mother’s absence. 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)). Finally, regarding the financial hardship referenced, counsel has not provided any documentation on appeal establishing the applicant's and her spouse's current financial situation, including income and expenses, assets and liabilities and the applicant's spouse's financial needs, to support the assertion that as a result of his wife's absence, the applicant's spouse is suffering financial hardship or career disruption. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of a long-term separation from the applicant. However, his situation if he remains in the United States is typical to individuals separated as a result of removal and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. The AAO concludes that based on the evidence provided, it has not been established that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse will experience extreme hardship were he to remain in the United States while the applicant resides abroad due to her inadmissibility.

The applicant's spouse contends that he would experience hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with his wife due to her inadmissibility. To begin, he explains that he was born in [REDACTED] and has no ties to [REDACTED] and unfamiliarity with the country, culture and customs would cause him emotional hardship. In addition, the applicant's spouse notes that he has been gainfully employed for many years and were he to relocate abroad, he would suffer career disruption. Moreover, the applicant's spouse asserts that he will not be able to obtain gainful employment in Colombia as he is a foreigner with no ties to the country, thereby causing him financial hardship. *Supra* at 1-4. Counsel further contends that the applicant's spouse would not feel safe in Colombia, especially in light of the fact that he is of indigenous descent. *Brief in Support of Appeal*.

The record establishes that the applicant's spouse was born in [REDACTED] and has no ties to [REDACTED]. Moreover, the AAO notes that the applicant's spouse has been residing in the United States since he was a minor and became a permanent resident more than twelve years ago. Were he to relocate abroad, he would have to leave his home, his community and his business, a lawn and tree services company that he acquired in early 2010. Moreover, the U.S. Department of State confirms that Colombia continues to have a high rate of poverty (37.2%) and one of the highest levels of income disparity in the world. *Background Note-Colombia, U.S. Department of States*, dated March 6, 2012. Finally, the U.S. Department of State has issued a travel warning advising of the dangers of travel to Colombia due to terrorist activity, crime and violence. *Travel Warning-Colombia, U.S. Department of State*, dated February 21, 2012. 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.

We can find extreme hardship warranting a waiver of inadmissibility only where an applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the scenario of separation *and* the scenario of relocation. A claim that a qualifying relative will relocate and thereby suffer extreme hardship can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no actual intention to relocate. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to relocate and suffer extreme hardship, where remaining in the United States and being separated from the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, also *cf. Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme

hardship from separation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse in this case.

The record, reviewed in its entirety, does not support a finding that the applicant's spouse will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Rather, the record demonstrates that he will face no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States or is refused admission. There is no documentation establishing that the applicant's spouse's hardships are any different from other families separated as a result of immigration violations. Although the AAO is not insensitive to the applicant's spouse's situation, the record does not establish that the hardships he would face rise to the level of "extreme" as contemplated by statute and case law. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, 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. The application is denied.