


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



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



H6 H2

FILE:



Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO  
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)

**JAN 07 2010**  
Date:

IN RE:



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)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City, 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 seeking readmission within ten years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant's spouse and child are U.S. citizens and he seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States.

The district director found that the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and the application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, at 4, dated November 14, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse states that the applicant told the consular officer that he had been arrested for a traffic violation and was told not to worry about it, he has never shoplifted and all of those charges were dismissed, and he is a good man who should be allowed to live in the United States with her and their daughter. *Form I-290B*, received November 28, 2006.

The record includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant's spouse and a photograph of the applicant and his daughter. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

The record reflects that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in February 2000 and departed the United States on November 2005. The applicant accrued unlawful presence during this entire period of time. The applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year and seeking readmission within ten years of his November 2005 departure from the United States.

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.

.....

(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 section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant or his daughter is not considered in section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to a qualifying relative, in this case the applicant's spouse. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

*Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship. These factors include the presence of 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.

The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse must be established whether she resides in Mexico or in the United States, as she is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request.

The first part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the event of relocation to Mexico. The applicant's spouse states that she has stayed in Mexico with the applicant on and off, and that she and their daughter both got very sick. *Applicant's Spouse's Third Statement*, dated November 17, 2006. She also asserts that she cannot run her and the applicant's business from Mexico. *Id.* However, the record does not contain documentary evidence to support these claims or of how any hardship that the applicant's daughter might encounter in Mexico would affect the applicant's spouse. Going on record without supporting documentation will not meet the applicant's burden of proof in this proceeding. *See 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)). The record lacks sufficient documentary evidence of emotional, financial, medical or other types of hardship that, in their totality, establish that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to Mexico.

The second part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship in the event that a qualifying relative remains in the United States. The applicant's spouse states that her daughter needs the applicant. *Applicant's Spouse's Third Statement*. The applicant's spouse states that she misses the applicant, their daughter cries when she leaves her side and she did not do this before the applicant left for Mexico, their daughter is very close to the applicant, the applicant was teaching their daughter Spanish, they own a moving company, the applicant did all of the everyday work for the company, she does not know how to do the paperwork or the moving, they will lose their company and she will not be able to pay her rent and bills, and she will have no way to take care of her daughter. *Applicant's Spouse's Second Statement*, dated January 9, 2006. The applicant's spouse states that the drive from Mexico to California is unsafe, she would be unable to keep their moving company without the applicant, and she and their daughter would have no money or place to live. *Applicant's Spouse's First Statement*, undated. The record does not contain documentary evidence to support claims or of how any hardship that the applicant's daughter might encounter would affect the applicant's spouse. The record lacks sufficient documentary evidence of emotional, financial, medical or other types of hardship that, in their totality, establish that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if she remained in the United States.

U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). For example, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *Hassan v. INS, supra*, held further that the uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* 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.