





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services


(b)(6)



DATE: **MAY 14 2014**

OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

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 Nebraska Service Center Director, Lincoln, Nebraska denied the waiver application and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Nicaragua 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 ten years of his last departure from the United States. The record indicates that the applicant is the spouse of a U.S. citizen and the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to reside in the United States.

The director concluded that the applicant 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. *See Decision of the Director*, dated September 11, 2013.

The applicant makes no new assertions on appeal, submits no additional evidence, and has provided no statement explaining any erroneous conclusion of law or fact in the decision being appealed. *See Form I-290B*, received October 15, 2013.

The record contains, but is not limited to: Form I-290B; a hardship letter from the applicant's spouse; various immigration applications and petitions; a request for evidence letter from USCIS; and a refusal worksheet from the U.S. State Department. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act provides:

(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.

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection or authorization in or about September 2005 and remained until he voluntarily departed to Nicaragua in May 2009. The applicant accrued unlawful presence in excess of one year. As the applicant is seeking admission within 10 years of his departure, he was found to be inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II). The record supports this

finding, the applicant does not contest inadmissibility, and the AAO concurs that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(9)(a)(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. Hardship to the applicant can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. In the present case, the applicant's spouse is his only 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*, 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.

The applicant's spouse writes that she and the applicant have known each other since adolescence and both went on to marry and start families with other people, she in the United States and the applicant in Nicaragua. The record indicates that they became reacquainted many years later, and following their mutual divorces the applicant and his spouse married each other in Nicaragua in January 2010. They have never resided together in the United States. The applicant's spouse states that being apart from one another and living in different countries has been both emotionally and financially difficult. She explains that she has visited the applicant on multiple occasions in Nicaragua but returning to the United States alone has become an extremely painful experience.

As explained in the director's decision, a request for additional evidence was sent by USCIS requesting documentary evidence supporting claims of economic and emotional hardship to the applicant's spouse. The request noted that this evidence should address hardship not only in the event of continued separation, but also in the event the applicant's spouse was to relocate to Nicaragua. The director noted that in response, the applicant submitted only a copy of the Form I-601. The applicant has not submitted any documentary evidence on appeal, has not addressed the evidentiary deficiencies identified by the director, and has not asserted that the director's decision contained any erroneous conclusion of law or fact.

The AAO acknowledges that separation from the applicant has and will likely continue to cause various difficulties for the applicant's spouse. However, we find the evidence in the record insufficient to demonstrate that the challenges encountered by the qualifying relative, when considered cumulatively, meet the extreme hardship standard.

The possibility of the applicant's spouse relocating to Nicaragua has not been addressed in the record. Though this deficiency was identified in the director's decision, it remains unaddressed by the applicant or his spouse on appeal. As the record contains no assertions of hardship related to relocation, the AAO cannot speculate in this regard. Accordingly, the AAO finds the evidence

insufficient to demonstrate that the applicant's qualifying relative spouse would suffer extreme hardship were she to relocate to Nicaragua to be with the applicant, during the remainder of his temporary period of inadmissibility.

The applicant has, therefore, failed to demonstrate that the challenges his spouse faces are unusual or beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to demonstrate extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. As the applicant has not established extreme hardship to a qualifying family member no purpose would be served in determining whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

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.