

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
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[Redacted]

H6

Date: **SEP 20 2012**

Office: DENVER

FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE: [Redacted]

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:

[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 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,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Denver, Colorado. 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 again seeking admission within ten years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse and child.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish that his qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of his inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated January 17, 2012.

On appeal, the applicant's attorney contends that the Field Office Director erred by finding that the applicant failed to demonstrate that his qualifying spouse would suffer extreme hardship.

The record contains an Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601); a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B); a brief from the applicant's attorney; affidavits from the qualifying spouse; relationship and identification documents for the applicant, qualifying spouse, her parents, her brother and her step-daughter; titles for their cars; financial documentation; police and court documents regarding the qualifying spouse's ex-husband's domestic violence case; country conditions documentation; letters from the applicant and qualifying spouse's employers; a real estate property listing; an Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485) and an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9) 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.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides for a waiver of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) inadmissibility as follows:

The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] 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 . . . 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 wife 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 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 hardship 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 hardship takes the case beyond those hardship 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 record indicates that the applicant entered the United States in 2000 without inspection and departed in 2004. The applicant accrued over one year of unlawful presence from 2000 until 2004. In applying for adjustment of status, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of his departure from the United States. Therefore, as a result of the applicant's unlawful presence, he is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. The applicant has not disputed his inadmissibility.

The AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that his qualifying spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of being separated from him. The applicant's spouse indicates in her affidavit that the applicant is her emotional support and helps her deal with the abuse that she endured in her prior marriage. In her first affidavit, she states that she could not "imagine what [her] life would be life if [the applicant] cannot remain in the U.S." with her. Although the qualifying spouse may suffer emotionally due to her separation from the applicant, the record fails to demonstrate in sufficient detail how the qualifying spouse's experiences and hardship would amount to hardship beyond that commonly experienced by other separated families. Further, the applicant's spouse also indicates that she would suffer financially as a result of her separation from the applicant because she would have to support the applicant in Mexico and the applicant's daughter in the United States. However, there is no documentation provided to show that the applicant would require her financial support in Mexico. Moreover, the record fails to document whether and to what extent the applicant provides financial support to his daughter. As such, the financial burden with respect to the step-daughter's care that the qualifying spouse indicates that she would undertake is unclear. The record contains financial documentation indicating the applicant and qualifying spouse's income, and expenses related to housing. The qualifying spouse also states in her affidavit that she has approximately \$3,000 in debt. However, there is no evidence in the record to show that the qualifying spouse has incurred financial debt or that she would struggle financially without the assistance of the applicant. The applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence to establish that the qualifying spouse would suffer emotional and financial hardships as a result of her separation from the applicant that, considered in the aggregate, are extreme.

However, the AAO finds that the applicant has met his burden of demonstrating that his qualifying spouse would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to Mexico to be with him. The qualifying spouse states in her affidavit that she was born and has always lived in Denver, Colorado. The qualifying spouse's entire immediate family also lives in the United States, including her parents, brother and step-daughter, in the Denver area, and she maintains a close relationship with them. The qualifying spouse states that she is a loan officer and could not find a job in Mexico because she does not know the Mexican financial laws. She would also lose her current stable employment with benefits. The record contains documentation confirming her current employment and benefits. The applicant's spouse also indicates that relocating to Mexico would cause her emotional hardship insofar as it would "make her relive the pain [she] suffered during [her] first marriage" by witnessing the violence of the cartels and culture of domestic violence. The record contains documentation regarding safety and other conditions in Mexico, and the most recent Department of State Travel Warning, dated February 8, 2012, notes that the non-essential travel to the state of Zacatecas, where the applicant is from, should be deferred and that extreme caution should be taken when traveling through the state as it is experiencing gun battles between criminal groups, roadblocks, false checkpoints on highways, robberies and carjackings. As such, the cumulative effect of the hardships to the qualifying spouse were she to relocate, in light of her family ties to the United States, her length of residence in the United States, her stable employment and country conditions in Mexico, rises to the level of extreme.

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. A claim that a qualifying relative will relocate and thereby suffer extreme hardship can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no actual intention to relocate. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to relocate and suffer extreme hardship, where remaining in the United States and being separated from the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, also *cf. Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship from separation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the qualifying relative in this case.

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 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.