




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




Date: **FEB 27 2013**

Office:


ATHENS, GREECE

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 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,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Egypt 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 seeking readmission within ten years of his last departure from the United States. The record indicates that the applicant is the son of U.S. citizens and the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to 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 parents.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on the applicant's qualifying relatives and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated April 5, 2012.

On appeal, the applicant's father claims that he is suffering extreme hardship. *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion*, dated April 27, 2012. The applicant also submits new evidence of hardship on appeal.

The record includes, but is not limited to, a statement from the applicant's father, medical documents for the applicant's father, financial documents, photographs, school records and Canadian documents for the applicant, country-conditions documents on Egypt, and documents pertaining to the applicant's removal proceeding. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at 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.

....

(iii) Exceptions.-

....

(II) Asylees.-No period of time in which an alien has a bona fide application for asylum pending under section 208 shall be taken into account in determining the period of unlawful presence in the United States under clause (i) unless the alien during such period was employed without authorization in the United States.

....

- (v) Waiver.-The [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 [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. Hardship to the applicant can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's parents are the only qualifying relatives 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-Moralez*, 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 of Immigration Appeals (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 v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998) (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.

In the present application, the record indicates that on July 19, 1996, the applicant entered the United States on a B-2 nonimmigrant visa. On July 9, 1997, the applicant filed an application for asylum. On December 31, 1997, an immigration judge denied the application but granted the applicant voluntary departure until February 3, 1998. The applicant filed an appeal with the Board, which the Board dismissed on April 29, 2002. On November 13, 2003, the applicant departed the United States and went to Canada, where he requested asylum. In March 2006, Canadian authorities returned the applicant to the United States. He was removed on April 4, 2006. The applicant accrued unlawful presence between April 30, 2002, and November 13, 2003. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year, and he seeks admission within 10 years of his departure from the United States. The applicant does not contest his inadmissibility.

Describing his hardship should he join the applicant in Egypt, the applicant's father claims that he suffers from medical conditions that cannot be treated in Egypt. Medical documentation in the record establishes that the applicant's father has had several heart attacks, a heart bypass, and he has been hospitalized many times over the years. He also suffers from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), hypertension, and arthritis, and he takes several medications. The applicant's father claims that his wife is also suffering from depression, and is being treated by a psychiatrist. Additionally, he states Egypt is going through a period of instability and insecurity, with many Coptic Christian churches being attacked.

Based on the record as a whole, including the applicant's father's safety concerns in Egypt, his serious medical issues and possible disruption of his treatment, the applicant's mother's mental health issues, and their separation from their family in the United States, the AAO finds that the applicant's parents would suffer extreme hardship if they were to join the applicant in Egypt.

Concerning the hardship that the applicant's parents would experience by remaining in the United States, the applicant's father states he is suffering financial hardship because his monthly expenses are \$1036 and he only receives \$871.36 in Social Security benefits. He states the applicant could help him financially if he was in the United States and help take care of him. In his statement, the applicant's father states he is 67 years old, he has suffered three heart attacks, and he had a heart bypass. In a letter dated April 7, 2008, Dr. [REDACTED] states the applicant's father "needs assistance at home" because he had a heart bypass and he suffers from COPD, hypertension, and arthritis. Additionally, medical documentation in the record establish that the applicant's father needs hearing aids. The applicant's father claims that he is disabled. Documentation in the record establishes that the applicant's father received disability benefits in 2002 and 2003. Additionally, the applicant's father claims his wife is depressed and under psychological care because of the separation from the applicant. No supporting evidence was submitted providing details or explaining the applicant's mother's psychological condition. Going on record without supporting evidence generally is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. See *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg'l Comm'r 1972)). Further, the applicant's father states the applicant lives alone with his daughter in Egypt, they are suffering, and he wants them to be in the United States.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's mother may be suffering emotionally in being separated from the applicant. While it is understood that the separation of loved ones often results in significant psychological challenges, the applicant has not distinguished his mother's emotional hardship upon separation from that which is typically faced by the loved ones of those deemed inadmissible. With respect to the applicant's father's medical hardship, although the record establishes that he suffers from several medical conditions, no medical documents have been submitted establishing that he specifically requires the applicant's assistance or explaining the severity and limitations caused by his medical conditions. Additionally, the applicant's two adult siblings reside near their parents, and it has not been established that they cannot assist their father. Moreover, though statements in the record refer to financial difficulties, the record does not contain evidence corroborating claims that the applicant's parents are suffering financial hardship. Further, the applicant has not distinguished his parent's financial

challenges from those commonly experienced when a family member remains in the United States. Based on the record before it, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that his parents would suffer extreme hardship if his waiver application is denied and they remains in the United States.

Although the applicant has demonstrated that his parents would experience extreme hardship if they relocated abroad to reside with the applicant, 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 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 relatives in this case.

In proceedings for 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. *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.