

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 24 2012 Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO  
(CIUDAD JAUREZ)

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 (the Act), 8 U.S.C. section 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 District Director, Mexico City, Mexico. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico. He was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of 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 admission within ten years of his last departure. He is married to a United States citizen. He 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).

The District Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to his admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, his U.S. citizen spouse, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) on June 29, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse details the emotional and financial hardships she is experiencing due to the applicant's inadmissibility and asks that United States Citizenship and Immigration Services approve the applicant's waiver. *Attachment, Form I-290B*, received on July 28, 2009.

The record includes, but is not limited to: statements from the applicant's spouse; statements from associates of the applicant's spouse; an employment offer for the applicant; copies of phone bills, rent receipts and other utilities bills for the applicant's spouse; a copy of a rental agreement in the applicant's spouse's name; a copy of a prescription notice for the applicant's spouse; a copy of medical notes taken while treating the applicant's spouse; copies of pay stubs for the applicant's spouse; a pay statement for the applicant from his Mexican employer; a copy of a medical statement from the applicant's Mexican doctor; and a photograph of the applicant, his spouse and their child. The entire record was reviewed and all relevant evidence considered in rendering this decision.

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

(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.

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in October 2000 and remained until he departed in November 2006. As the applicant has resided unlawfully in the United States for over a year and is now seeking admission within ten years of his last departure from the United States, he is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides for a waiver of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) inadmissibility as follows:

The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] 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 . . . 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 or his child can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's spouse 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 USCIS then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, 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-I-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, the applicant’s spouse explains that she and her daughter are experiencing tremendous emotional stress due to separation from the applicant. *Statement of the Applicant’s Spouse*, received July 28, 2009. She states that the applicant played a big part in her daughter’s life, provided financially for the family while residing in the United States and that she is under such tremendous emotional stress that it is impacting her ability to perform her employment duties. She states that she worries constantly about the applicant in Mexico because of the conditions there, and that his employment in Mexico does not provide enough money for him to survive.

The record includes a prescription notice in the applicant’s spouse’s name, as well as a copy of an Adult Progress Note from the Family Health Centers of San Diego. The Progress Note contains hand-written notes by [REDACTED] which discuss the emotional impacts on the applicant’s spouse, and which seem to indicate he has given her a prescription for medication to help control her symptoms of depression. The record also contains letters from associates of the applicant’s spouse attesting to the emotional impacts of separation from the applicant.

The AAO considers the evidence of emotional impact on the applicant's spouse informative. While the documentation submitted is not sufficiently probative to establish that the applicant's spouse has been diagnosed with an ongoing mental health condition, it does indicate that she is experiencing emotional impacts and symptoms of depression. As such, the AAO will give this factor consideration when aggregating the impacts on the applicant's spouse due to separation.

As discussed above, children are not qualifying relatives in this proceeding. Thus, any hardship to them is only relevant to the extent that it results in hardship on the qualifying relative, in this case the applicant's spouse. While the AAO acknowledges that the applicant's child will experience hardships related to his inadmissibility, it does not find the record to contain evidence distinguishing any emotional impact on their child from that which is commonly experienced by the relatives of inadmissible aliens who remain in the United States, or showing that hardship experienced by the child will elevate hardship to the applicant's spouse to an extreme level.

With regard to the financial impact of the applicant's departure, the record contains phone bills, insurance bills, rental agreements, and other utilities statements in the applicant's spouse's name. The record also contains copies of pay stubs from the applicant's spouse's employer. These documents illustrate that the applicant's spouse has monthly financial obligations, however, they are not sufficient to demonstrate that she is experiencing uncommon financial hardship rising to the level of extreme hardship.

When the hardship impacts on the applicant's spouse due to separation are considered in the aggregate, the AAO does not find them to rise above the common consequences of inadmissibility to the degree of extreme hardship.

The applicant has not outlined what impacts, if any, his spouse might experience if she were to relocate to Mexico. As such, the AAO does not find the record to establish that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship upon relocation to Mexico.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's spouse will experience emotional hardship if she remains in the United States without the applicant, but the applicant has failed to demonstrate that this hardship, even when combined with other hardship factors, will be extreme. The AAO recognizes the significance of family separation as a hardship factor, but concludes that the hardship articulated in this case, based on the evidence in this record, does not rise above the common result of removal or inadmissibility and thus does not constitute extreme hardship. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of removal or inadmissibility are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation.

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 rests with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act,

Page 6

8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.