Date: **OCT 28 2011**  Office: TEGUCIGALPA  FILE: 

IN RE: 


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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 $630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen. 

Thank you, 

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office
DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Tegucigalpa, Honduras, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant, a native and citizen of Honduras, entered the United States without authorization in May 2002 and did not depart the United States until November 2008. The applicant was thus 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. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse.

The field office director determined that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. Decision of the Field Office Director, dated July 9, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant submits the following: the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion to the Administrative Appeals Office (Form I-290B); a letter from the applicant’s spouse, dated July 27, 2009; and a Final Primary Treating Physician’s Medical-Legal Evaluation Permanent and Stationary Report from [redacted] dated January 14, 2009. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

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 waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act is dependent on 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 U.S. citizen spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. Hardship to the applicant 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-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 Pitch, 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]elavent 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 U.S. citizen spouse contends that she will experience emotional, physical and financial hardship were she to remain in the United States while her husband resides abroad due to his inadmissibility. In a declaration, the applicant’s spouse asserts that she misses her husband, and long-term separation from him is causing her emotional hardship. She explains that she is sad, depressed and lonely. In addition, the applicant’s spouse states that she got sick in April 2008 as a result of her job and continues to experience problems in her back and thus needs her husband to help her on a daily basis. Letter from [REDACTED] dated July 27, 2009. Finally, the applicant’s spouse asserts that she needs her husband to return to the United States as he is the one who provides most of the income for the household. Letter from [REDACTED] dated November 25, 2008.

In support of the emotional and physical hardships referenced, a report has been provided by [REDACTED] confirming that the applicant’s spouse experienced workplace injuries while employed as a dry clean worker with [REDACTED]. The report, however, confirms that the applicant’s spouse’s conditions have reached maximum medical improvement and she is thus able to return to her pre-injury work if the referenced restrictions can be accommodated. Alternatively, the report states, the applicant’s spouse may be placed in a vocational retraining program. See Final Primary Treating Physician’s Medical-Legal Evaluation Permanent and Stationary Report from [REDACTED] dated January 14, 2009. The report submitted does not establish what, if any, hardships the applicant’s spouse will experience were the applicant specifically unable to reside in the United States.

As for the financial hardship referenced, the applicant has not provided evidence, such as documentation of his and his spouse’s current income and expenses or any assets and liabilities, to support the assertion that the applicant’s spouse is experiencing financial hardship as a result of her husband’s inadmissibility. The AAO notes that no documentation has been provided establishing that the applicant in fact was contributing financially to the household prior to his departure from the United States, as the Form G-325A submitted by the applicant indicates that the applicant was unemployed since August 2007. Moreover, it has not been established that the applicant is unable to obtain gainful employment in Honduras that will permit him to assist his wife financially in the United States. Finally, the record indicates that the applicant’s spouse’s two daughters reside in the United States. It has not been established that they would not be able to assist their mother, emotionally, physically and/or financially, should the need arise. Going on record without supporting

The AAO recognizes that the applicant’s U.S. citizen spouse will endure hardship as a result of long-term separation from the applicant. However, her situation, if she 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. The AAO concludes that based on the evidence provided, it has not been established that the applicant’s spouse will experience extreme hardship were she to remain in the United States while the applicant resides abroad due to his inadmissibility.

With respect to relocating abroad to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility, the record does not contain any information or evidence concerning potential hardship to the applicant’s spouse were she to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility. As such, it has not been established that the applicant’s spouse would experience extreme hardship if she relocated abroad to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility.

The record, reviewed in its entirety, 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 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 or is refused admission. There is no documentation establishing that the applicant’s spouse’s hardships are any different from other families separated as a result of immigration violations. Although the AAO is not insensitive to the applicant’s spouse’s situation, the record does not establish that the hardships she would face rise to the level of “extreme” as contemplated by statute and case law. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 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. The application is denied.