


(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 18 2013

Office: DENVER, COLORADO


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 (AAO) in your case. This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Field Office Director, Denver, Colorado, denied the waiver application and 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 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 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 in order to reside with her husband 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 Mexico, 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 that circumstances have turned tragic for the applicant and her husband as their one-month old baby recently passed away. 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 an updated letter from the applicant's husband, Mr. [REDACTED] a copy of the birth certificate of the couple's son; a copy of the death certificate of the couple's son; and a copy of an autopsy report.

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 AAO previously found the applicant 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. Counsel does not contest this finding on motion.

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, Mr. [REDACTED], will suffer extreme hardship if the applicant’s waiver application were denied. The AAO previously found that if Mr. [REDACTED] relocated to Mexico to be with his wife, he would experience extreme hardship. The AAO will not disturb that finding. The AAO also finds that if Mr. [REDACTED] remains in the United States without his wife, he would suffer extreme hardship. Additional evidence submitted on motion shows that Mr. [REDACTED] and his wife have recently suffered the loss of their first child. According to documents submitted on motion, the couple’s son was one month old when he died from *Escherichia coli* sepsis. The record shows that he was well, but then became fussy and the couple brought him to the hospital where he was flown to another hospital and died the next day. The AAO recognizes the significant trauma Mr. [REDACTED] and his wife have experienced and acknowledges Mr. [REDACTED] contentions that he “would be left in ruins” if he was separated from his wife and that without his wife, he would crumble. Considering the new evidence submitted on motion, in addition to the unique factors of this case, including the fact that Mr. [REDACTED] and the applicant have been a couple since they were in high school, the AAO finds that the hardship Mr. [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 Mr. [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

factors in the present case include the applicant's unlawful presence in the United States and periods of unauthorized employment. The favorable and mitigating factors in the present case include: the applicant's family ties to the United States, including her U.S. citizen husband; the hardship to the applicant's entire family if she were refused admission; letters of support describing the applicant as a kind, genuine, trustworthy, honest and courteous friend; the applicant's volunteer involvement with her church; and the applicant's lack of any arrests or criminal convictions.

The AAO finds that, although the applicant's immigration violations are 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.

In application proceedings, it is the applicant's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has been met.

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