


Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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

PUBLIC COPY



H6

DATE: Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO FILE:

IN RE: **MAR 30 2012** 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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must 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, 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 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 her last departure from the United States. The applicant's spouse and younger child are U.S. citizens, her older child 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 October 5, 2009.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the officer or clerk assigned to receive the Form I-601 rejected most of the evidence. *Form I-290B*, dated November 4, 2009.

The record includes, but is not limited to, several statements and financial documents. 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 June 2002, and departed the United States in September 2008. 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 more than one year and seeking readmission within ten years of her September 2008 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 children 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.

Counsel states that the applicant’s spouse plans to obtain his bachelor’s degree; he has been working with Robinson Helicopters since 2003; he receives medical, dental, vision, life insurance, retirement and college education benefits; and the children will not be able to attend school in the United States. The record includes an employer letter for the applicant’s spouse.

The applicant’s spouse states that the mechanical skills he learned in the Army and with his company will not be useful in Mexico; he has cutting edge skills in helicopter mechanics, but in Mexico they use older helicopters which demands older technology; he would earn considerably less money in Mexico assuming he found a job; he would lose his current job with [REDACTED] and his company benefits; he would be a decade behind in technology and would be at a serious disadvantage upon returning to the United States; they would have to find a buyer for their home; and given the housing market, they would lose equity on their property. The record includes a mortgage statement for the applicant and her spouse. The applicant’s spouse states that taking their newborn to an unfamiliar territory is not healthy due to unknown dangers in that place, such as medical facilities.

The record reflects that the applicant’s spouse would be leaving a good employment situation, he may have to sell his home and he would be raising two children in Mexico who would lose educational opportunities. However, the record does not include supporting documentary evidence that he could not find suitable employment in Mexico. The record does not include supporting documentary evidence of safety issues to the applicant’s spouse and family, or of medical issues that they may experience. The record lacks sufficient documentary evidence of emotional, financial, medical or other types of hardship that, in their totality, establish that a qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship upon relocating to Mexico.

The applicant's spouse states that the applicant attended monthly school meetings for their older child; the mother-son relationship would be hindered; and he fears for the applicant's safety. The applicant's spouse states that the applicant and their daughter have been in Mexico since September 2008; he and their son have remained in the United States; he is constantly worried about their safety and well-being in Mexico; he is worried about their son and his own well-being; their son has been emotionally affected by separation from the applicant; their son asks about the applicant every day and his school performance and interaction with other children has been affected; he wakes up at 4:30 AM to prepare his son's breakfast, comes home at 4:30 PM and does household chores and cares for his son; he purchases telephone cards to talk with the applicant; he is unable to spend quality time with his son; he was promoted to a supervisor at work and he is concerned about his standing at work; he is extremely exhausted mentally and emotionally; he has barely spent any time with his daughter; and he is missing her first words and steps.

One of the applicant's son's teacher's states that the applicant's son had some anxiety which would affect his learning and concentration; and he would become a confident child with the stability provided by the applicant. His principal details the son's discipline issues and states he has taken a turn for the worse without the applicant's care. The record includes numerous letters from family and friends which detail the emotional hardship that the applicant's spouse and son are experiencing; and the role that the applicant played in their lives.

The record reflects that the applicant played a significant role in her spouse's life and son's life; her spouse is currently separated from their daughter; her spouse and son are experiencing emotional hardship; her son is having discipline issues; and her spouse is raising their son on his own. 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.

Although the applicant has demonstrated that the qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship if separated from the applicant, 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. The AAO has long interpreted the waiver provisions of the Act to require a showing of extreme hardship in both possible scenarios, as a claim that a qualifying relative will remain in the United States and thereby suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of separation can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no intention to separate in reality. *See Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to separate and suffer extreme hardship, where relocating abroad with the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, *see also Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship from relocation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the qualifying relative in this case. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* Section 291 of the


Page 6

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.