

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**

(b)(6)

Date: **MAY 29 2013**

Office: ANAHEIM

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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:

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".

f.s.
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 sustained. The waiver application will be approved.

The record establishes that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who entered the United States without authorization in 1996 and did not depart the United States until March 2011. The applicant was thus 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. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her U.S. citizen spouse and children, born in 1998 and 2007.

The field office director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated July 20, 2012.

In support of the appeal, counsel for the applicant submits the following: a brief; a declaration from the applicant's spouse; and documentation regarding country conditions in Mexico. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9), states in pertinent part:

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.

....

(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...

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 U.S. citizen spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. Hardship to the applicant or the children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. 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 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.

The applicant’s U.S. citizen spouse contends that he will suffer emotional and financial hardship were he to remain in the United States while his wife resides abroad due to her inadmissibility. In a declaration, the applicant’s spouse explains that as a result of his wife’s inadmissibility, he has become sole caregiver and provider to his children and that has caused mental stress to his well-being and has disrupted his life to the extent that his life is at risk. Further, he notes that he is constantly worried about his wife’s safety and well-being while in Mexico due to the high rates of crime and violence. *Declaration of* [REDACTED] dated November 7, 2012. In a separate statement, the applicant details that she is primary caregiver to her children, attentive to their studies and their education and their morals and their nutrition. *Letter and Translation from* [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated April 17, 2010. Counsel, on appeal, explains that were the applicant to remain abroad due to her inadmissibility, her spouse will be left as a single father, raising a 5 year old girl and a teenage boy. In said role, counsel contends that the applicant’s spouse would be forced to cut back on his weekly work hours in order to tend to the needs of his children, including transportation to and from school and activities, and providing for their basic needs such as food, laundry, and moral and educational nurturing, thereby causing him hardship. Finally, counsel notes that long-term separation from their mother would cause the children and by extension, their father, the only qualifying relative in this case, hardship. *Brief in Support of Appeal*, dated December 31, 2012.

Evidence in the record establishes the role the applicant’s spouse plays as sole financial provider for the family while the applicant cares for the children. In addition, a letter has been provided from [REDACTED] Community Services Coordinator, [REDACTED], referencing the applicant’s critical role as a parent volunteer. *See Letter from* [REDACTED] *Community Service Coordinator*, [REDACTED] dated January 27, 2010. Moreover, a letter from the applicant’s son,

Samuel, has been provided establishing his loneliness and depression due to long-term separation from his mother. Finally, the AAO notes that the U.S. Department of State has issued a travel warning for Mexico specifically referencing Michoacán, the applicant's birthplace. The travel warning notes that all non-essential travel to the state of Michoacán should be deferred. *See Travel Warning-Mexico, U.S. Department of State*, dated November 20, 2012. The record reflects that the cumulative effect of the emotional and financial hardship the applicant's spouse would experience due to the applicant's inadmissibility rises to the level of extreme. The AAO thus concludes that were the applicant unable to reside in the United States due to her inadmissibility, the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he remains in the United States.

With respect to relocating abroad to reside with the applicant as a result of her inadmissibility, counsel notes that the applicant's spouse has been residing in the United States for almost 20 years and no longer has significant ties to Mexico. In addition, counsel explains that the applicant and her family are church members and the applicant's spouse has been gainfully employed as a Field Supervisor since 1993. Moreover, counsel references the applicant's children's strong ties to the United States. Finally, counsel maintains that country conditions in Mexico, and most notably Michoacán, the applicant's home state, are very dangerous and were the applicant's spouse and children to relocate to Mexico, their safety would be a risk. *Supra* at 3-5.

The record establishes that the applicant's children, most notably their son, [REDACTED] are fully integrated into the United States lifestyle and educational system. The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) found that a fifteen-year-old child who lived her entire life in the United States, who was completely integrated into the American lifestyle, and who was not fluent in Chinese, would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to Taiwan. *Matter of Kao and Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45 (BIA 2001). The AAO finds *Matter of Kao and Lin* to be persuasive in this case due to the similar fact pattern. To uproot the applicant's children at this stage of their education and social development and relocate them to Mexico would constitute extreme hardship to them, and by extension, to the applicant's spouse, the only qualifying relative in this case. In addition, the record reflects that the applicant's spouse has been living and working in the United States for almost two decades and no longer has ties to Mexico. Finally, as noted above, the U.S. Department of State has issued a travel warning for Mexico specifically referencing Michoacán, the applicant's birthplace. It has thus been established that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to her inadmissibility.

Accordingly, the AAO finds that the situation presented in this application rises to the level of extreme hardship. However, the grant or denial of the waiver does not turn only on the issue of the meaning of "extreme hardship." It also hinges on the discretion of the Secretary and pursuant to such terms, conditions and procedures as he may by regulations prescribe. In discretionary matters, the alien bears the burden of proving eligibility in terms of equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. *See Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957).

In evaluating whether . . . relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the factors adverse to the alien include the nature and underlying

circumstances of the exclusion ground at issue, the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws, the existence of a criminal record, and if so, its nature and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of the alien's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country. The favorable considerations include family ties in the United States, residence of long duration in this country (particularly where alien began residency at a young age), evidence of hardship to the alien and his family if he is excluded and deported, service in this country's Armed Forces, a history of stable employment, the existence of property or business ties, evidence of value or service in the community, evidence of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and other evidence attesting to the alien's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends and responsible community representatives).

See Matter of Mendez-Morales, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). The AAO must then, "[B]alance the adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented on the alien's behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of the country." *Id.* at 300. (Citations omitted).

The favorable factors in this matter are the extreme hardship the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse and children would face if the applicant were to reside in Mexico, regardless of whether they accompanied the applicant or remained in the United States, community ties, church membership, volunteer work, the apparent lack of a criminal record, the payment of taxes, letters in support and the passage of more than seventeen years since the applicant's entry to the United States without authorization. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's unauthorized entry and presence in the United States.

The immigration violations committed by the applicant are serious in nature and cannot be condoned. Nonetheless, the AAO finds that the applicant has established that the favorable factors in her application outweigh the unfavorable factors. Therefore, a favorable exercise of the Secretary's discretion is warranted.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has sustained that burden. Accordingly, this appeal will be sustained and the application approved.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The waiver application is approved.