





**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**


(b)(6)



Date: **SEP 25 2013**

Office: COLUMBUS

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:



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. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements.** See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Columbus, Ohio, 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 or 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 and U.S. citizen children.

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, accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated March 1, 2013.

In support of the appeal, counsel for the applicant submits the following: a brief; a letter from the applicant's spouse; medical documentation pertaining to the applicant's children, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] articles regarding family separation; and country condition documentation. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

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-

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year...and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, or

(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...

The applicant entered the United States without authorization in or around 1989. In 2005, the applicant departed the United States. Shortly thereafter, in April 2005, she procured entry to the United States by presenting her Ohio driver's license. The record indicates that the applicant has not departed the United States since her last entry in 2005. See *Record of Sworn Statement*, dated January 7, 2013. In the present case, the record reflects that the applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997 until her departure in 2005. The applicant is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States.

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 lawful permanent resident spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. Hardship to the applicant or her seven U.S. citizen children, born in 1990, 1993, 1995, 2001, 2004 and 2007, 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. I.N.S.*, 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 lawful permanent resident spouse contends that he will suffer extreme hardship were he to remain in the United States while his wife relocates abroad due to her inadmissibility. In his declaration, the applicant’s spouse explains that he has been with the applicant for over 11 years and she is the pillar of the family. He contends that as a result of his wife’s inadmissibility, he is anxious and depressed and is having a hard time functioning. He further explains that he had an alcohol problem in the past and his wife helped him with his addiction and were he to be separated from the applicant, he may go back to his addiction. In addition, the applicant’s spouse explains that he is a masonry worker and his job is oftentimes out of town or 14 hours a day and he needs his wife to care for his three young children. He notes that his children suffer from numerous problems and he needs his wife. Moreover, the applicant’s spouse maintains that were his wife to relocate abroad, his children would experience hardship as a result of long-term separation from their mother. Financially, the applicant’s spouse explains that his wife works as a housekeeper and without her financial contributions, he will not be able to pay the bills. Finally, the applicant’s spouse references the serious problems in Mexico, including drug and gang related violence, kidnappings, police

corruption and abuse, government corruption, discrimination, violence against women and trafficking, especially in Tamaulipas, the applicant's birthplace. He worries that his wife will be faced with significant, life threatening risks to her personal safety. See Letter from [REDACTED]

The AAO acknowledges the applicant's spouse's contention that he and the children will experience emotional hardship were the applicant to relocate abroad, but the record does not establish the level to which this would affect their life. In addition, no documentation has been provided to establish that the applicant's spouse would be unable to properly care for his children while continuing to financially provide for the family. Nor has any documentation been provided on appeal from the applicant's children's treating physician outlining their current medical prognosis, the treatment plan and what assistance they need from the applicant specifically. Nor has any documentation been provided establishing the applicant's and her spouse's income and expenses and assets and liabilities, to support the applicant's spouse's contention that he needs his wife's financial contributions to ensure that all financial obligations are met. Finally, the articles provided on appeal from counsel regarding the drug war in Mexico do not establish that the applicant specifically would be in danger were she to return to her home country. It has thus not been established that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship were he to remain in the United States while his wife relocates abroad as a result of her inadmissibility.

In regards to relocating abroad to reside with the applicant, this criterion has not been addressed. As such, it has not been established that the applicant's spouse, a native of Mexico, would experience extreme hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to her inadmissibility.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant's spouse will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Rather, the record demonstrates that he will face no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States and/or refused admission. Although the AAO is not insensitive to the applicant's spouse's situation, the record does not establish that the hardships he would face rises to the level of "extreme" as contemplated by statute and case law.

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 not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.