

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**



H/s

DATE: **MAY 21 2012** Office: SANTO DOMINGO 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 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

fs-  
Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record establishes that the applicant, a native and citizen of [REDACTED] was admitted to the United States on a B1/B2 visa in [REDACTED] overstayed his nonimmigrant admission, and lived here until [REDACTED] when he departed. As a result, after a [REDACTED] consular interview for an immigrant visa, he 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. The applicant is married to a U.S. Citizen and is the beneficiary of a Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The applicant does not contest the finding of inadmissibility. Rather, he is seeking a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse.

The field office director concluded the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and, accordingly, denied the Application for Waiver of Ground of Inadmissibility (Form I-601). *Decision of the District Director, April 21, 2010.*

On appeal, the applicant contends that USCIS failed to properly evaluate the hardship to his wife and also provides new documentary evidence. In support of the appeal, newly-submitted money transfer records comprise the only documentation to support the extreme hardship claim. Besides the original waiver request and a supporting statement from the applicant's wife, the record also contains documents including, but not limited to: birth, marriage, and divorce certificates; and an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The entire record was reviewed and 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.

....

(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...

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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 U.S. citizen 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-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 provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an applicant has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). 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; the Board added that not all of these factors need be analyzed in any given case and emphasized that the list is 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, while 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, or cultural readjustment 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, although 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)); conversely, *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 case-by-case whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

The applicant's wife contends she is suffering, and will continue to suffer, emotional and financial hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Although the record contains his wife's December 2009 statement asserting her sadness at being separated from her husband, she provides no evidence reflecting the actual emotional impact on her of his absence or demonstrating how their separation has affected her life. Therefore, the evidence on record is insufficient to establish that she is suffering hardship beyond the normal or typical effects of being separated from a loved one by deportation or inadmissibility. Regarding financial hardship, the applicant's wife provides wire transfers showing she sent him amounts ranging from \$40 to \$400 between July 23, 2007 and May 7, 2010. Although both the applicant and his wife state that the financial support needed to maintain two households represents a hardship to her, they have submitted no evidence of income, expenses, or other liabilities either in Trinidad and Tobago or the United States to substantiate this claim. The applicant's wife claims that her twice yearly visits to Trinidad and Tobago to see her husband had become a burden after five years, but provides no evidence of the cost of these trips or whether she continued them after 2009. There is no indication what economic resources the applicant has in Trinidad and Tobago, although we note he told his consular interviewer in January 2010 that would soon receive his share of the estimated \$100,000 estate of his father, who died in 2008. Therefore, the evidence falls short of establishing particularly harsh consequences beyond those commonly or typically associated with separation of husband and wife.

For all these reasons, the cumulative effect of the emotional and financial hardships the applicant's wife is experiencing due to her husband's inadmissibility does not rise to the level of extreme. The AAO concludes based on the evidence provided that, were his wife to remain in the United States without the applicant due to his inadmissibility, she would not suffer extreme hardship beyond those problems normally associated with family separation.

The qualifying relative does not contend that she would experience hardship if she relocated abroad to reside with the applicant. The record reflects that she married the applicant in his country and claims to have travelled there regularly to see him for five years after his departure, but is silent

regarding the impact on her of moving overseas. Therefore, in view of the lack of evidence provided regarding the impact on a qualifying relative of relocating abroad, the AAO concludes the applicant has not established that his wife would suffer extreme hardship were she to relocate to reside with the applicant.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant's qualifying relative will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Rather, the record demonstrates that she will face no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States and/or refused admission. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to his wife as required under section 212(i) of the Act.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, this appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.