



(b)(6)


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**



DATE: **MAY 23 2013** OFFICE: ANAHEIM, CA

FILE: 

IN RE:

APPLICANT: 

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

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,

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 International Adjudications Support Branch on behalf of the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and 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 seeking readmission within 10 years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her lawful permanent resident spouse.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant failed to demonstrate the existence of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *See Decision of Field Office Director* dated September 22, 2012.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse contends the continued separation from the applicant causes emotional and financial difficulties. In support, the spouse submits statements from the applicant and their daughter, letters from family and friends, documentation of money transfers, photographs, and documents in Spanish.

The record includes, but is not limited to, the documents listed above, other applications and petitions, photographs, evidence of birth, marriage, and residence, and other evidence in Spanish without an English language translation. The AAO notes that the documents in Spanish without a certified English language translation cannot be considered on appeal, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. §103.2(b)(3)(2013).¹ As such, besides the Spanish language documents without certified English translations, 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.

¹ 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3) (2013) states:

(3) Translations. Any document containing foreign language submitted to USCIS shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English.

(ii) Construction of unlawful presence.- For purposes of this paragraph, an alien is deemed to be unlawfully present in the United States if the alien is present in the United States after the expiration of the period of stay authorized by the Attorney General or is present in the United States without being admitted or paroled.

....

(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 admitted in a consular interview that she entered the United States without inspection in March 2000 and returned to Mexico in March 2010. Inadmissibility is not contested on appeal. The AAO therefore finds that, based on the present record, the applicant accrued more than one year of unlawful presence, and is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act until March 2020. The applicant's qualifying relative for a waiver of this inadmissibility is her lawful permanent resident spouse.

The record contains references to hardship the applicant's child would experience if the waiver application were denied. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an alien's children as a factor to be considered in assessing extreme hardship. In the present case, the applicant's spouse is the only qualifying relative for the waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, and hardship to the applicant's child will not be separately considered, except as it may affect the applicant's spouse.

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 v. I.N.S.*, 138 F.3d 1292 (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.

The applicant's spouse claims he experiences financial difficulties because he has to support two households. Copies of money transfers are submitted. He adds that he also experiences emotional hardship given the current separation from the applicant and their daughter, who both reside in Mexico. He states that because he is working the cane season, he cannot return to Mexico to visit them for seven months. The spouse asserts that he worries about his family in Mexico due to the disturbing news reports. The applicant contends she always hears about people who are being

killed, kidnapped, stolen from, or assaulted, and that she consequently lives in fear. Their daughter states in a letter that she misses her father and her grandparents in the United States. Letters from family and friends describe the applicant's good moral character, and indicate that she and her spouse have a loving relationship.

Despite submission of copies of money transfer statements, the record does not contain sufficient documentation of the spouse's or the applicant's income and household expenses to support assertions of financial hardship. The applicant further fails to provide any evidence on whether she would be able to alleviate any financial difficulties if she could join her spouse in the United States. Without details of the family's expenses and income, the AAO is unable to assess the nature and extent of financial hardship, if any, the applicant's spouse will face.

The applicant and her spouse contend that because the conditions are so dangerous in Mexico, the spouse worries about her and their daughter's safety. The record reflects that the applicant and her daughter live in Tarimoro, Guanajuato, Mexico. The AAO notes that there is no U.S. Department of State travel warning or advisory on this area. See *Travel Warning: Mexico, U.S. Department of State*, November 20, 2012. Furthermore, the applicant has not submitted any evidence establishing that the country conditions in Guanajuato, Mexico, are as the applicant claims. Although these 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)). Without such supporting evidence, the AAO can only give limited weight to the assertions on country conditions in Tarimoro, Mexico, and the hardship the spouse experiences due to these conditions.

The record reflects that the applicant's spouse experiences some emotional difficulties given the present separation from the applicant. While the AAO acknowledges that the applicant's spouse would face difficulties as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility, we do not find evidence of record to demonstrate that his hardship would rise above the distress normally created when families are separated as a result of inadmissibility or removal. In that the record fails to provide sufficient evidence to establish the financial, emotional, or other impacts of separation on the applicant's spouse are cumulatively above and beyond the hardships commonly experienced, the AAO cannot conclude that he would suffer extreme hardship if the waiver application is denied and the applicant remains in Mexico without her spouse.

The record contains no assertions or documentation on hardship the applicant's spouse, a native and citizen of Mexico, would experience upon relocation to that country. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to demonstrate her spouse would experience extreme hardship upon relocation to Mexico.

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 her lawful permanent resident spouse 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 the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for a 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.