


(b)(6)

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




Date: JUL 03 2013

Office: ROME, ITALY

FILE:




IN RE: Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v)

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.

Thank You,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Rome, Italy. The Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed a subsequent appeal. The matter is now before the AAO on motion. The motion will be granted and the underlying waiver application will be approved.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Spain who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act in order to reside with her husband and children in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. The AAO dismissed the appeal, finding that although the applicant established that her husband would suffer extreme hardship if he relocated to Spain, there was insufficient evidence in the record to show that he would suffer extreme hardship if he remained in the United States.

On motion, counsel contends the applicant's husband's entire personality has changed since his wife departed the United States. Counsel submits additional evidence of emotional hardship.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

Here, counsel has submitted additional new documentary evidence to support the applicant's waiver application. The applicant's submission meets the requirements of a motion to reopen. Accordingly, the motion is granted.

In addition to the documents specified in the AAO's previous decision, the record now also contains a letter from a therapist and a letter from the applicant's husband's employer.

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

(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 [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.

In this case, the record shows, and the applicant does not contest, that she entered the United States in August 1989 as a visitor for pleasure and remained beyond her authorized stay until her departure in June 2008. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of enactment of unlawful presence provisions under the Act, until her departure from the United States in June 2008. The applicant accrued eleven years of unlawful presence. Accordingly, she is 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 one year or more and seeking admission to the United States within ten years of her last departure.

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.

After a careful review of the entire record, the AAO finds that the applicant’s husband, [REDACTED] will suffer extreme hardship if the applicant’s waiver application were denied. The AAO previously found that if [REDACTED] relocated to Spain to be with his wife, he would experience extreme hardship. The AAO will not disturb that finding. The AAO also finds that if [REDACTED] remains in the United States, he would suffer extreme hardship. Additional evidence submitted on motion shows that [REDACTED] has been seeing a therapist due to the emotional distress of being separated from his wife. According to the therapist, [REDACTED] has a significant sense of hopelessness and helplessness, reported losing over twenty pounds, and has had suicidal ideation, difficulty sleeping, and poor concentration at work. The therapist diagnosed [REDACTED] with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and states that [REDACTED] coping mechanisms are no longer working. In addition, a letter from [REDACTED] employer of over twelve years states that he is a changed man since his wife left the United States. According to the employer, [REDACTED] used to be a “happy-go-lucky worker” for the construction company who never missed a day of work. The employer states that [REDACTED] is now often stressed, depressed, and gets nasty and impatient with his coworkers, which is out of character for him. The employer contends that although [REDACTED] is still a good worker, his stress and anxiety compromises his focus at work, which could be dangerous to him and his fellow construction workers. Considering the new evidence submitted on motion, in addition to the unique factors of this case, including the fact that the applicant and her husband have been married to each

other twice and have two children together, one of whom has special needs, the AAO finds that the hardship [REDACTED] would suffer if he remains in the United States is extreme, going well beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with inadmissibility or exclusion. The AAO therefore finds that the evidence of hardship, considered in the aggregate and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors cited above, supports a finding that [REDACTED] faces extreme hardship if the applicant is refused admission.

The AAO also finds that the applicant merits a waiver of inadmissibility as a matter of discretion.

In discretionary matters, the alien bears the burden of proving that positive factors are not outweighed by adverse factors. *See Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). The adverse factor in the present case includes the applicant's unlawful presence in the United States. The favorable and mitigating factors in the present case include: the applicant's significant family ties to the United States, including her U.S. citizen husband and children; the hardship to the applicant's entire family if she were refused admission; letters of support describing the applicant as a good mother who is the backbone of the family; and the applicant's lack of any arrests or criminal convictions.

The AAO finds that, although the applicant's immigration violation is serious and cannot be condoned, when taken together, the favorable factors in the present case outweigh the adverse factors, such that a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted.

ORDER: The motion will be granted and the underlying waiver application is approved.