

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[REDACTED]

H6

DATE: **NOV 06 2012** OFFICE: PANAMA CITY FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to 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:

[REDACTED]

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of Ecuador 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 one year or more and seeking readmission within 10 years of departure from the United States. The applicant is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130) filed on his behalf by his U.S. citizen spouse. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility under 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.

In a decision dated May 26, 2011, the Field Office Director concluded that the hardship that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse would suffer did not rise to the level of extreme as required by the statute and the application for a waiver of inadmissibility was denied accordingly.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant does not contest the applicant's inadmissibility, but states that the applicant's spouse will in fact suffer from extreme hardship as a result of his inadmissibility. On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal counsel indicated that he would be forwarding a brief and/or additional information to the AAO within 30 days. The file contains no additional information so the record is considered complete.

In support of the waiver application, the record includes, but is not limited to a letter from the applicant's spouse, biographical information for the applicant and his spouse, medical records for the applicant's spouse, and documentation of the applicant's immigration history.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more. Section 212(a)(9) of the Act provides:

(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 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 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. No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action by the Attorney General regarding a waiver under this clause.

The applicant stated that he entered the United States without inspection on or about July 2, 2004 and remained in the United States unlawfully through March 12, 2010, accruing unlawful presence during that entire period. As the period of unlawful presence accrued is one year or more, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for a period of 10 years from his departure from the United States. The applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility on appeal.

The applicant is eligible to apply for a waiver of this ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, as the spouse of a U.S. citizen. In order to qualify for this waiver, however, he must first prove that the refusal of his admission to the United States would result in extreme hardship to his qualifying relative. Hardship to the applicant is not considered in 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings unless it is shown to cause hardship to a qualifying relative, in this case the applicant's spouse. 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 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 deportation, 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, 885 (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.

On appeal, counsel states that extreme hardship would result if the applicant’s waiver application were denied. In regards to the hardship that the applicant’s U.S. citizen spouse would suffer as a result of separation from the applicant, counsel states that the applicant’s spouse would suffer financial and medical hardship. In her statement dated March 29, 2010, the applicant’s spouse states that she has been suffering from “serious depression” and “high anxiety,” as well as insomnia. In support of that statement, the record contains a two-sentence letter dated March 30, 2010 from [REDACTED] stating that the applicant “is being treated for depression since her last visit on 3/22/10. When she complained of sadness, easy cry and lack of concentration and energy.” The record also indicates that the applicant’s spouse was prescribed Zoloft, Xanax, Vibramycin, and Phenergan DM. There is no indication in the record of the duration of the applicant’s spouse’s symptoms or their impact on her day to day functioning. The AAO notes that significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate, are relevant factors in establishing

extreme hardship. The evidence on the record, however, is insufficient to establish that the applicant's spouse suffers from such a condition. Absent an explanation in plain language from the treating physician of the exact nature and severity of any condition and a description of any treatment or family assistance needed, the AAO is not in the position to reach conclusions concerning the severity of a medical condition or the treatment needed.

The applicant's spouse also states that due to separation from the applicant, she has more expenses to handle on her own, where she previously was able to rely on the applicant's financial support. She states that she has three children from a prior relationship that sometimes need her financial help, and that she also sends financial support to the applicant in Ecuador. There is no documentation in the record, however, to support these assertions. The record does not contain evidence of the applicant's spouse's income, expenses, or the stated financial support provided to her children or the applicant. There is also no record of the applicant's contribution to his spouse's financial well-being prior to his departure from the United States. Based on the documentation provided, it is not possible to determine the degree of financial hardship suffered by the applicant's spouse as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility. Although the applicant's spouse's assertions are relevant and have been taken into consideration, little weight can be afforded them in the absence of supporting evidence. See *Matter of Kwan*, 14 I&N Dec. 175 (BIA 1972) ("Information in an affidavit should not be disregarded simply because it appears to be hearsay; in administrative proceedings, that fact merely affects the weight to be afforded it."). Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *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)). Without supporting evidence, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the applicant's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. See *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 n.2 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1, 3 n.2 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). The AAO recognizes the impact of separation on families, but the evidence in the record, when considered in the aggregate, does not indicate that the hardship in this case is extreme. *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. at 383.

The record does not contain any documentation regarding the hardship that the applicant's spouse would suffer if she were to relocate to Ecuador. The AAO notes that the applicant's spouse is a U.S. citizen born in Puerto Rico. She is fluent in Spanish and has not stated what hardship she would suffer if she were to relocate to Ecuador. Although the applicant's spouse states that she provides some financial support to her children from a previous relationship, the record does not establish her family ties in the United States or the degree that separation from those family members would cause her hardship. The record indicates that the applicant's spouse was suffering from depression, anxiety, and insomnia. It is not clear from the record, however, whether she would continue to suffer from those conditions if she were to be reunited with the applicant in Ecuador. It is also not clear from the record that treatment for those conditions would be unavailable in Ecuador. Again, going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158 at 165. Based on the information provided, considered in the aggregate, the

evidence does not illustrate that the hardship suffered in this case, should the applicant's spouse relocate to Ecuador, would be beyond what is normally experienced by families dealing with removal or inadmissibility. *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. at 383.

Although the applicant's spouse's concern over the applicant's immigration status is neither doubted nor minimized, the fact remains that Congress provided for a waiver of inadmissibility only under limited circumstances. In nearly every qualifying relationship, whether between husband and wife or parent and child, there is a deep level of affection and a certain amount of emotional and social interdependence. While, in common parlance, the prospect of separation or involuntary relocation nearly always results in considerable hardship to individuals and families, in specifically limiting the availability of a waiver of inadmissibility to cases of "extreme hardship," Congress did not intend that a waiver be granted in every case where a qualifying relationship, and thus the familial and emotional bonds, exist. The point made in this and prior decisions on this matter is that the current state of the law, viewed from a legislative, administrative, or judicial point of view, requires that the hardship, which meets the standard in section 212(a)(9)(B)(v), of the Act, be above and beyond the normal, expected hardship involved in such cases.

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 a qualifying relative as required under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. As the applicant has not established extreme hardship to a qualifying family member, no purpose would be served in determining whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for an 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. 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.