(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

[redacted]

Date: APR 0 2 2013 Office: CIUDAD JUAREZ, MEXICO FILE: [redacted]

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B) and under section 212(d)(11) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(11)

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,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. 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 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 again seeking admission within ten years of her last departure from the United States, and under 212(a)(6)(E)(i) as an alien who at any time knowingly has encouraged, induced, assisted, abetted, or aided any other alien to enter or to try to enter the United States in violation of law. The record reflects that the applicant and her children entered the United States without inspection in May 2000, with the applicant remaining until departing for Mexico in January 2011. The applicant is the spouse of a United States citizen. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her spouse.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish that her qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of her inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director* dated July 28, 2012.

On appeal the applicant submits financial documentation.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) 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.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides for a waiver of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) inadmissibility as follows:

> The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] 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 . . . 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.

Section 212(a)(6)(E) provides, in pertinent part:

> (E) Smugglers.-
>
> (i) In general.-Any alien who at any time knowingly has encouraged, induced, assisted, abetted, or aided any other alien to enter or to try to enter the United States in violation of law is inadmissible.
>
> ...
>
> (iii) Waiver authorized-For provision authorizing waiver of clause (i), see subsection (d)(11).

Section 212(d)(11) of the Act provides:

> The Attorney General [now Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, "Secretary"] may, in his discretion for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest, waive application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(E) in the case of . . . an alien seeking admission or adjustment of status as an immediate relative or immigrant under section 203(a) (other than paragraph (4) thereof), if the alien has encouraged, induced, assisted, abetted, or aided only an individual who at the time of such action was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter (and no other individual) to enter the United States in violation of law.

Section 212(d)(11) of the Act provides that the Attorney General may, in his discretion, for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest, waive the charge of inadmissibility under INA 212(a)(6)(E)(i) for alien smuggling, if the alien has encouraged, induced, assisted, abetted, or aided an individual who, at the time of the action, was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter, to enter the U.S. in violation of law. *See Matter of Farias*, 21 I&N Dec. 269, 281-282 (BIA 1997) (holding that the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 amended the INA to limit the availability of the waiver to only those aliens who have smuggled an individual who at the time of the offense was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter); *Selimi v. INS*, 312 F.3d 854, 861 (7th Cir. 2002) (finding that under section 212(d)(11) of the Act an alien is ineligible for a waiver "if he has aided someone other than his spouse, parent, son, or daughter").

To qualify for a section 212(d)(11) waiver, the alien must be a lawful permanent resident who temporarily proceeded abroad voluntarily and not under an order of removal, and must be otherwise admissible to the U.S. as a returning resident under section 211(b), or the alien must be seeking admission or family-sponsored adjustment of status as an immediate relative or immigrant under section 203(a) of the Act (excluding brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens who are twenty-one or older).

In addition to establishing statutory eligibility for a waiver under INA 212(d)(11), the applicant must demonstrate that he or she merits the grant of such waiver in the exercise of discretion.

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 husband is the only qualifying relative in this case. 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-Moralez,* 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. *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 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 record contains references to hardship the applicant's children 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 under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v)) of the Act. 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 children will not be separately considered, except as it may affect the applicant's spouse.

On appeal the applicant's spouse asserts that he must work two jobs to pay for their home and the applicant's hospital bill for heart surgery. In her statement the applicant contends she has two daughters in school and her spouse cannot keep up with them. The spouse also asserts that she had heart surgery and needs to see her doctor and also needs to get a job to help her children.

The AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that her qualifying spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of being separated from the applicant. The applicant has submitted no detail or documentation regarding any emotional hardship her spouse may be experiencing due to separation. The applicant and spouse claim financial hardship and submitted money transfer receipts, utility bills, and a collection notice for a medical bill. However, the record contains no other documentation establishing the spouse's current income, expenses, assets, and liabilities or overall financial situation to establish that without the applicant's physical presence in the United States the applicant's spouse will experience financial hardship. Further, courts considering the impact of financial detriment on a finding of extreme hardship have repeatedly held that, while it must be considered in the overall determination, "[e]conomic disadvantage alone does not constitute "extreme hardship." *Ramirez-Durazo v. INS*, 794 F.2d 491, 497 (9th Cir. 1986)

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, his situation if he remains in the United States is typical to individuals separated as a result of removal and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. In regards to establishing extreme hardship in the event the qualifying relative relocates

abroad based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request, the AAO notes that this criterion has not been addressed.

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 U.S. citizen spouse will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Rather, the record demonstrates that she 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 hardship she would face rises to the level of "extreme" as contemplated by statute and case law.

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 or if the applicant qualifies for a waiver under section 212(d)(11) of the Act.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, 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.