

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: **OCT 26 2012**

Office: VIENNA, AUSTRIA

FILE: 

IN RE: 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 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,

  
for

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Vienna, Austria. 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 Romania 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. The applicant entered the United States on July 5, 2004, and was authorized to stay until January 1, 2005. The applicant contends that he applied for a visa extension; however, there is no evidence of a request to extend his stay in the United States in the record. The applicant subsequently departed the United States on September 17, 2009, and thus was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year. The applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility, but rather 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 U.S. Citizen spouse.

The field office director concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Form I-601 accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated May 27, 2011.

The record contains the following documentation: a statement by the applicant's current attorney on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion;<sup>1</sup> brief in support of the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, submitted by the applicant's former attorney; statements by the applicant's wife, the applicant's step-daughter, and the applicant's wife's ex-husband; a psychiatric evaluation for the applicant's wife; and financial documentation. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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

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.

.....

---

<sup>1</sup> The Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, indicated that counsel would submit a brief and/or additional evidence to the AAO within 30 days. However, no brief or additional evidence was received by the AAO, thus the record is considered complete.

(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) 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. The applicant's U.S. citizen spouse is the qualifying relative in this case. Under these two provisions of the law, children are not deemed to be "qualifying relatives." However, although children are not qualifying relatives under the statute, USCIS does consider that a child's hardship can be a factor in the determination whether a qualifying relative experiences extreme hardship. 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 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.

The applicant’s former counsel contended that the applicant’s spouse went into a state of depression while visiting Romania, and sought medical treatment in Romania. The record includes a doctor’s statement from Romania dated July 10, 2010, which indicated that the applicant’s spouse was suffering from a major depressive stage following the refusal of an immigrant visa to the United States for the applicant. Subsequent to this report, the applicant’s spouse received a psychiatric evaluation in the United States on September 9, 2010. The psychiatric examination gave the diagnosis of “Adjustment Disorder, Depressed R/O Major depressive Disorder,” indicating that the applicant’s spouse was not suffering from a major depressive disorder. The psychiatric evaluation prescribed anti-depressants and psychiatric treatment. There is no evidence in the record that the applicant’s spouse has sought further psychiatric treatment. The evidence on the record is insufficient to conclude that the emotional problems that the applicant’s spouse is experiencing are resulting in hardship beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility

The applicant’s former counsel also contended that the applicant’s spouse is suffering from financial hardship in the form of a student loan repayment for her daughter and credit card debt. The record includes evidence of student loans for the applicant’s daughter. The AAO notes that the applicant’s daughter is no longer a minor, and that the applicant’s daughter has completed her degree at the [REDACTED], in New York City. There is no evidence of the credit card debt of the applicant’s spouse in the record. The record does include financial documentation related to remittances that the applicant’s spouse has sent to the applicant in Romania. However, there is no evidence regarding the employment and salary of the applicant’s spouse in the United States. There is no evidence in the record to conclude that the qualifying spouse is unable to meet her financial obligations in the applicant’s absence. Courts considering the impact of financial detriment on a finding of extreme hardship have repeatedly held that, while it must be considered in the overall determination,

"[e]conomic disadvantage alone does not constitute "extreme hardship." *Ramirez-Durazo v. INS*, 794 F.2d 491, 497 (9th Cir. 1986).

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, her situation, if she remains in the United States, is typical to individuals separated as a result of removal and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. The difficulties that the applicant's wife is facing as a result of her separation from the applicant, even when considered in the aggregate, do not rise to the level of extreme as contemplated by statute and case law.

In regard to the applicant's spouse relocating to Romania to reside with the applicant, the AAO notes that the applicant's spouse was born in Romania, and is familiar with the language and customs of that country.

The applicant's former counsel contended that the applicant's spouse is taking care of her ex-husband in the United States, who has medical problems. The applicant's former counsel states that the applicant's spouse is taking care of her ex-husband as a moral duty, because he has no other relatives. The record includes a letter from a specialty hospital and nursing facility which states that the applicant's spouse's ex-husband is suffering from hypertension, stroke, and hemiparesis on the right side, and is wheelchair bound. The letter indicates that the applicant's spouse's ex-husband is in the care of this facility, and there is no evidence in the record the ex-husband requires the presence and assistance of the applicant's spouse in the United States. Counsel further contended that there are two other elderly relatives that need to be visited every weekend, but there is no evidence in the record as to who these elderly relatives are, or how the applicant's spouse's presence in the United States is required to assist them.

Based on the evidence on the record, the applicant has not established that his spouse would suffer hardship beyond the common results of removal if she were to relocate to Romania 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 U.S. citizen spouse 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. Although the AAO is not insensitive to the applicant's spouse's situation, the record does not establish that the hardship she would face rises to the level of extreme as contemplated by statute and case law.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, 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. The waiver application is denied.