

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 18 2012** Office: CIUDAD JUAREZ, MEXICO 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:

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.

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

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that 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 more than one year and seeking readmission within ten years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and he is the father of a U.S. citizen child and stepchild. He is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). 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 spouse, son, and stepdaughter.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on the applicant's qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated September 22, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant's wife states she is suffering from depression and anxiety, she cannot stay employed, and her son is in speech therapy. *Statement from the applicant's wife, attached to Form I-290B*, filed September 22, 2009. The applicant's wife submits new evidence of hardship on appeal.

The record includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant's wife, letters of support, medical documentation for the applicant's wife, and evidence regarding the applicant's son's speech therapy. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9) 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 [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 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, his child, or stepchild can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's wife 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 United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (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 of Immigration Appeals (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.

In the present application, the record indicates that in February 2001, the applicant entered the United States without inspection. In November 2006, the applicant departed the United States. The applicant accrued over one year of unlawful presence between February 2001 and November 2006. The applicant is, therefore, 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 more than one year, and he seeks admission within 10 years of his departure from the United States. The applicant does not contest his inadmissibility.

The record contains references to hardship the applicant's child and stepchild would experience if the waiver application were denied. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an alien's child as a factor to be considered in assessing extreme hardship. In the present case, the applicant's spouse is the only qualifying relative for the waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, and hardship to the applicant's child and stepchild will not be separately considered, except as it may affect the applicant's spouse.

Regarding the hardship the applicant's wife would suffer should she join the applicant in Mexico, she states she suffers from depression and anxiety attacks, and documentation in the record establishes that she has been prescribed antidepressant medication. She also states that although she has considered moving to Mexico to be with the applicant, their children would have better opportunities in the United States, they are unfamiliar with the culture of Mexico, they do not speak Spanish, and they would fall behind in school because of their lack of Spanish language skills.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's wife is a citizen of the United States and relocation abroad would involve some hardship. However, the applicant has not submitted objective documentary evidence that demonstrates that she will experience hardship in Mexico. Going on record without supporting documentation is not sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof in this proceeding. *See 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)). The record also lacks evidence establishing that the applicant's wife cannot receive treatment for her mental health condition in Mexico or that she has to remain in the United States

to receive treatment. Additionally, though the applicant's son and stepdaughter may suffer some hardship in Mexico, they are not qualifying relatives, and the applicant has not shown that hardship to his son and stepdaughter would elevate his wife's challenges to an extreme level. Therefore, based on the record before it, the AAO finds that, considering the potential hardships in the aggregate, the applicant has failed to establish that his wife would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to Mexico.

In addition, the record fails to establish extreme hardship to the applicant's wife if she remains in the United States. The applicant's wife states their lives are empty without the applicant. As noted above, she is suffering from depression and anxiety attacks, and she takes medication. Documentation in the record establishes that the applicant's wife has been prescribed an antidepressant. She states she has problems sleeping, she checks on the children every two hours, and since the applicant returned to Mexico, she has lost her sense of security. She claims that with her condition, at times she cannot get out of bed, she cannot hold down a job, and she is "always crying or tired." In an undated statement, the applicant's wife states she is unemployed. In earlier statements submitted with the waiver application, the applicant's wife explains that she needs the applicant to return to the United States because he financially supports their family.

The applicant's wife states she is now a single mother and her children are suffering without the applicant. She claims that the applicant raised her daughter as his own, and her son suffers from speech problems. She also worries about the impact of her depression on the children. Documentation in the record establishes that the applicant's son was being evaluated by his school for speech problems, and that he attended several speech therapy sessions in November and December 2007.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's wife may be suffering some emotional difficulties in being separated from the applicant. While it is understood that the separation of spouses often results in significant psychological challenges, the applicant has not distinguished his wife's emotional hardship upon separation from that which is typically faced by the spouses of those deemed inadmissible. Though the applicant's wife refers to financial difficulties, the record does not contain evidence corroborating the applicant's wife's statements that she is unable to support herself in the applicant's absence. Additionally, the applicant has not distinguished his wife's financial challenges from those commonly experienced when a family member remains in the United States. Further, the record does not establish that the applicant is unable to obtain employment in Mexico and, thereby, financially assist his wife from outside the United States. The AAO also notes that the applicant's wife may be experiencing some hardship in having to care for their children alone. The record does not establish, however, that her hardship is extreme. Although the applicant's son and stepdaughter may be experiencing hardship in being separated from the applicant, the applicant has not shown that their hardship has elevated his wife's challenges to an extreme level. Based on the record before it, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that his wife would suffer extreme hardship if his waiver application is denied and she remains in the United States.

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that the hardships faced by the qualifying relative, considered in the aggregate, rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to

establish extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse as required under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, the AAO finds no purpose would be served in discussing whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for 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. *See* 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.