

Identifying data deleted to
protect privacy and prevent
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: JUN 25 2012 Office: MEXICO CITY FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the 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 with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a 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
Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Mexico City. The matter 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 Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act in order to reside with his wife and child in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated July 6, 2010.

On appeal, the applicant's wife contends she has been experiencing extreme hardship since her husband's departure from the United States. She states she is experiencing pain, anguish, and frustration due to her family's separation and submits a report from a psychologist.

The record contains, *inter alia*: letters from the applicant's wife, Ms. [REDACTED] a letter from the couple's daughter's school; a psychologist's report; a letter from a psychotherapist; a letter from the couple's church; a letter from the couple's daughter's physician; and an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision on the appeal.

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.

....

(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.

In this case, the record shows, and the applicant does not contest, that he entered the United States in November 2001 without inspection and remained until July 2009. The applicant accrued unlawful presence of over eight years. He now seeks admission within ten years of his 2009 departure. Accordingly, he 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 admission to the United States within ten years of his last departure.

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.

In this case, the applicant's wife, Ms. [REDACTED] states that she is suffering severe emotional hardship and submits a psychologist's report. She contends her four year old daughter is also suffering and submits a letter from her daughter's school. In addition, Ms. [REDACTED] states that her salary alone is not enough to cover the bills and that she needs her husband's income to survive. Furthermore, Ms. [REDACTED] contends she was born in the United States and has lived her entire life in the United States. She states she could not move to Mexico to be with her husband because he is from [REDACTED], a very remote town far from any city, an area where there are no opportunities or medical services.

After a careful review of the record, there is insufficient evidence to show that the applicant's wife, Ms. [REDACTED] has suffered or will suffer extreme hardship if her husband's waiver application were denied. If Ms. [REDACTED] decides to stay in the United States, their situation is typical of individuals separated as a result of inadmissibility or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. Regarding Ms. [REDACTED] financial hardship claim, there are no financial documents in the record to support this claim. There is no documentation addressing wages and no documentation addressing the couple's regular, monthly expenses such as rent, mortgage, or child care expenses. With respect to the emotional hardship claim, the record contains a letter from a psychotherapist and a psychological report. According to the psychotherapist, Ms. [REDACTED] has been diagnosed with severe depression and is in counseling. The letter, dated September 4, 2009, does not indicate how long Ms. [REDACTED] was purportedly in counseling. According to the psychological report, Ms. [REDACTED] has been diagnosed with Dysthymic Disorder and Schizoid Personality Disorder. According to the report, she "has schizoid traits, that is, she tends to withdraw, avoids emotional interactions, is passive dependent and does not seek ascendance over others." The report states that after her husband was denied entry into the United States, she was at first numb, then sad and depressed, and has now "managed to maintain a very fragile level of inner stability." Although the AAO is sympathetic to the family's circumstances, and recognizes that the input of any

medical professional is respected and valuable, neither the letter from the psychotherapist nor the report show that the applicant's situation is unique or atypical compared to other individuals in similar circumstances. *See Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996) (holding that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defining extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected). The AAO also notes that the psychological report, dated August 9, 2010, appears to be based on a single visit, makes no mention of Ms. [REDACTED]'s purported previous counseling sessions, and makes diagnoses that are different from the psychotherapist's letter. Moreover, although the record contains a letter from the couple's daughter's physician stating that their daughter was recently seen for separation anxiety disorder, the letter itself explains that she is suffering from "common separation related issues." Therefore, there is no evidence the hardship Ms. [REDACTED] has experienced or will experience is unique or atypical. Even considering all of these factors cumulatively, there is insufficient evidence showing that the hardship the applicant's wife has experienced or will experience amounts to extreme hardship.

Furthermore, the record does not show that Ms. [REDACTED] would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to Mexico to be with her husband. The record shows that Ms. [REDACTED] is currently thirty-one years old and, according to the psychological report, is fluent in Spanish. There is no indication in the record she has any physical or mental health issues for which she is currently undergoing treatment. To the extent Ms. [REDACTED] contends her husband is from a very remote town, there is no evidence in the record addressing conditions in Zacatecas. To the extent Ms. [REDACTED] contends that she and her daughter may not have the same access to quality medical care and educational opportunities in Mexico compared to the United States, the record does not show that Ms. [REDACTED] relocation to Mexico would be any more difficult than would normally be expected under the circumstances. Even considering all of the evidence cumulatively, the record does not show that the applicant's wife's hardship would be extreme, or that their situation is unique or atypical compared to others in similar circumstances. *Perez v. INS, supra*.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's wife caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, 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, 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.