

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

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



tt6

DATE: **SEP 18 2012** OFFICE: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER FILE:

IN RE:

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:

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Center Director, St. Albans, Vermont. 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 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 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 her behalf by her 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 her spouse.

In a decision dated November 4, 2010, the Center Director concluded that the applicant did not establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and the application for a waiver of inadmissibility was denied accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant does not contest her inadmissibility, but states that her spouse will in fact suffer from extreme hardship as a result of her inadmissibility.

In support of the waiver application, the record includes, but is not limited to statements from the applicant's spouse, biographical information for the applicant's children, school records for the applicant's son, documentation of the applicant's spouse's employment, documentation of the applicant's rent, medical records for the applicant and her spouse, a psychological evaluation of the applicant and her spouse, documentation of financial support sent to the applicant by her spouse, tax returns for the applicant, 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, in pertinent part, that:

(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 she entered the United States without inspection in May 2006 and remained in the United States unlawfully through July 31, 2007, accruing unlawful presence during this 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 her 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, she must first prove that the refusal of her admission to the United States would result in extreme hardship to her qualifying relative. Hardship to the applicant or her children is not considered 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings unless it is shown to cause hardship to the qualifying relative. 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, the applicant states that her U.S. citizen spouse would suffer financial, physical, and emotional hardship as a result of her inadmissibility. The applicant’s spouse states that he suffered emotional and financial hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. The record reflects that the applicant’s spouse sent financial support to the applicant in Mexico. The applicant’s spouse also provided documentation of his employment in the United States and documentation that he earned approximately [REDACTED] per year. There is no evidence in the record, however, that the applicant’s spouse’s financial support of the applicant in Mexico resulted in financial hardship to him. Additionally, the applicant’s spouse stated that he had debt in the United States, but he did not provide any evidence of that debt or its impact on his financial health. 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)). The applicant’s spouse also states that as a result of separation from the applicant, he was “depressed and stressed out.” He says that his emotional and physical health was significantly affected by his stress; however, there is no documentation in the record indicating the effects of separation from the applicant on her spouse’s emotional or physical health. 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 is insufficient to establish; however, 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 the emotional hardship that the applicant was suffering, he returned to Mexico to reside there with the applicant and their son. The record reflects that the applicant suffered a miscarriage on December 3, 2009. Since that time, the record reflects that the applicant and her spouse had another child who was born on December 7, 2011. The AAO notes that hardship to the applicant or to her children is only relevant to the extent that it is shown to cause hardship to the qualifying relative. Here, the applicant’s spouse chose to relocate to Mexico because of the emotional hardship that the applicant was suffering. The kind of hardship described to the applicant’s spouse, however, appears to be the type of hardship normally experienced by individuals separated due to immigration violations. 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 applicant’s spouse states that he has resided in Mexico since December 3, 2009 and, as a result, has suffered from financial and physical hardship. He also states that due to the instability caused by his spouse’s immigration inadmissibility, he is suffering from emotional hardship. The applicant’s spouse provided documentation of his employment in Mexico. Although the income is lower than it was in the United States, the record reflects that the applicant’s spouse’s expenses are also lower in Mexico. There is no indication in the record that the applicant’s spouse is not able to support himself and his family on his income. Additionally, the applicant’s spouse states that he suffered an injury on his job that resulted in back pain. A letter from the Mexican Institute of Social Security, dated January 19, 2011, does not indicate the exact nature of the applicant’s spouse’s present condition, nor do the other medical records submitted. Again, 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 is insufficient to establish, however, 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. Additionally, the applicant has submitted a psychological evaluation dated January 21, 2011, conducted by [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] that the applicant's family, including her spouse and her son, are suffering from "stress, anxiety, insecurity, dependence, and problems in making decisions." [REDACTED] recommends that the family improve communication, spend more time together, and try to achieve stability in the applicant's spouse's residence with the applicant and her son. The evaluation does not indicate that relocation to Mexico has resulted in emotional hardship to the applicant's spouse, but rather states that the family relationship would be improved if all members resided in the same location. Based on the information provided, considered in the aggregate, the evidence does not illustrate that the hardship suffered in this case, as a result of the applicant's spouse relocation to Mexico, is 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 his 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 she 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.