

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



H₂

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: DEC 03 2008

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability 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:

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, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom, Acting Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The District Director, Mexico City, Mexico (Ciudad Juarez), denied the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Ground of Excludability under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v). The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a 27-year-old native and citizen of Mexico who was found inadmissible to the United States for having been unlawfully present for more than one year. The applicant's spouse, [REDACTED], is a United States citizen. The couple was married in 2003. They have two daughters born in 2004 and 2007, respectively. The applicant presently seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to return to the United States and be admitted as a lawful permanent resident.

The district director determined that the applicant was inadmissible, and that she was ineligible for a waiver of inadmissibility because its denial would not result in extreme hardship to her spouse. The waiver application was denied accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant submits a brief and supporting documentation maintaining that the family's separation is causing extreme emotional and financial hardship to her spouse.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9), 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.

The consular officer, and the district director, found the applicant inadmissible on the basis of her unlawful presence in the United States. The applicant entered the United States in 2003 and departed in 2005 in order to complete her immigrant visa processing in Mexico. In so doing, she triggered the unlawful presence inadmissibility ten-year bar to admission to the United States. The applicant does not dispute the inadmissibility finding. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant is inadmissible as charged. The question remains whether she is eligible for a waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v).

A waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) is dependent upon a showing that the bar to admission imposes an extreme hardship on a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant herself is not a permissible consideration under the statute. Hardship to the applicant's U.S. citizen daughter is also not a permissible consideration under the statute, except as it impacts the applicant's spouse.

The concept of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative "is not . . . fixed and inflexible," and whether extreme hardship has been established is determined based on an examination of the facts of each individual case. *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board of Immigration Appeals set forth a list of non-exclusive factors relevant to determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. These factors include, with respect to the qualifying relative, the presence of family ties to U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents in the United States, family ties outside the United States, country conditions where the qualifying relative would relocate and family ties in that country, the financial impact of departure, and significant health conditions, particularly where there is diminished availability of medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate. *Id.* at 566. The BIA has held:

Relevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists. In each case, the trier of fact 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.

Matter of O-J-O-, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (citations omitted).

The applicant's spouse is a 27-year-old native-born U.S. citizen. He and the applicant were married in 2003 and had two daughters; [REDACTED] was born in the United States in 2004 and [REDACTED] was born in Mexico in 2007. [REDACTED], a U.S. citizen, has suffered from dental and medical problems. The record suggests that she has been treated in Mexico and in the United States. The record indicates that since the applicant's departure in 2005, her spouse has been traveling back and forth to Mexico. The applicant's spouse currently resides in North Carolina with his parents. The applicant claims that her spouse's trips back and forth to Mexico have resulted in financial hardship, as he has had to sell their home and his share of a restaurant business he co-owns with his father. The applicant further claims that the family's separation is causing extreme emotional hardship to her spouse and children.

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 would face extreme hardship if the applicant is denied the waiver. Although the AAO recognizes that the family's separation causes hardship, such hardship is common to all individuals in the applicant's circumstances and does not rise to the level of "extreme." See *Shooshtary v. INS*, 39 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 1994) (stating that "the extreme hardship requirement . . . was not enacted to insure that the family members of excludable aliens fulfill their dreams or continue in the lives which they currently enjoy. The uprooting of family, the separation from friends, and other normal processes of readjustment to one's home country after having spent a number of years in the United States are not considered extreme, but represent the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens in the respondent's circumstances"). The record also does not establish that the applicant's spouse

would face extreme hardship should he relocate permanently to Mexico. *See Ramirez-Durazo v. INS*, 794 F.2d 491, 499 (9th Cir. 1986) (holding that “lower standard of living in Mexico and the difficulties of readjustment to that culture and environment . . . simply are not sufficient”). In sum, the record at best indicates that the applicant’s spouse would face the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties that arise whenever a family member is removed from the United States.

Congress provided for a waiver of inadmissibility, but under limited circumstances. In limiting the availability of the waiver to cases of “extreme hardship,” Congress did not intend that a waiver be granted in every case where a qualifying relationship exists. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of removal are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991); *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996); *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996) (holding that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968) (holding that separation of family members and financial difficulties alone do not establish extreme hardship). Further, demonstrated financial difficulties alone are generally insufficient to establish extreme hardship. *See INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981) (upholding BIA finding that economic detriment alone is insufficient to establish extreme hardship).

The AAO therefore finds that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse as required under section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility rests 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.