



U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

A2

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536




FILE: [Redacted] Office: San Francisco

Date: AUG 21 2000

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under § 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(i)

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:

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

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Terrence M. O'Reilly, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, San Francisco, California, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Philippines who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under § 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having procured admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation in April 1997. The applicant married a native of the Philippines and naturalized U.S. citizen in January 1998 and is the beneficiary of a petition for alien relative. The applicant seeks the above waiver in order to remain in the United States and reside with her spouse and U.S. citizen child born August 1999.

The district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative. The district director also concluded that the applicant did not warrant a favorable exercise of the Attorney General's discretion and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, counsel states that the district director failed to properly consider the evidence in the record, failed to balance the negative and positive factors in the case and attached excessive weight to the applicant's misrepresentation while disregarding the extreme hardships that the U.S. citizen spouse and son shall suffer.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's passport was a genuine Philippine passport in all respects, except for the surname, which is false and the date of birth is false. Counsel states that it was a name-substituted passport. Counsel argues that the district director attached excessive weight to the applicant's misrepresentations while disregarding the extreme hardship to her spouse and child. Counsel states that the applicant discovered the irregularities on the passport when she received the document at the Manila International Airport but since the applicant was already at the airport, and she really wanted to go to the United States to find work, ...she felt obliged to use the false passport anyway. It is stated that the applicant's former counsel failed to safeguard the applicant's rights and should have known the law and regulations regarding submitting a fraudulent document to obtain an immigration benefit. It is stated that the applicant's former counsel never warned her of the possible adverse consequences and she did not know that the Service considered it a fraud to file an application using false information.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant's spouse and child would suffer economic hardship if separated from the applicant by having to incur unnecessary expenses, high expenses for travel, long distance telephone calls and child care. The prospect of separation has caused the applicant's husband distress and he is being treated by a psychologist. Counsel submits a May 9, 2000 letter which indicates that the applicant's husband was diagnosed with an adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood.

The prognosis was that the condition would worsen if he is separated from his wife.

On appeal, counsel submitted a medical report dated June 19, 2000 which indicates that the applicant was rear ended by a vehicle traveling approximately 10 miles per hour on April 30, 1999. The physician states that the applicant's husband is continuing physical therapy and may continue to work without restrictions.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant has no other immigration history, has no criminal record, is apologetic and remorseful for her fraudulent conduct.

Counsel states that the applicant's spouse and child would suffer extreme hardship if they accompanied the applicant to the Philippines. Her husband would have to resign from his present job and lose all of his benefits.

There are no laws that require a United States citizen to leave the United States and live abroad. Further, the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See Hassan v. INS, 927 F.2d 465 (9th Cir. 1991). 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. See Shoostary v. INS, 39 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 1994). In Silverman v. Rogers, 437 F.2d 102 (1st Cir. 1970), the court stated that, "even assuming that the Federal Government had no right either to prevent a marriage or destroy it, we believe that here it has done nothing more than to say that the residence of one of the marriage partners may not be in the United States."

The record reflects that the applicant procured a name-substituted passport and used that document to procure a nonimmigrant visa and admission into the United States in April 1997 by fraud or willful misrepresentation. She later applied for and was granted an extension of temporary stay.

Section 212(a) CLASSES OF ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS OR ADMISSION.-Except as otherwise provided in this Act, aliens who are inadmissible under the following paragraphs are ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States:

(6) ILLEGAL ENTRANTS AND IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS.-

(C) MISREPRESENTATION.-

(i) IN GENERAL.-Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) ADMISSION OF IMMIGRANT INADMISSIBLE FOR FRAUD OR WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATION OF MATERIAL FACT.-

(1) The Attorney General may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, waive the application of clause (i) of

subsection (a) (6) (C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, 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 that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

(2) No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action of the Attorney General regarding a waiver under paragraph (1).

Sections 212(a) (6) (C) and 212(i) of the Act were amended by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), Pub L. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009. There is no longer any alternative provision for waiver of a § 212(a) (6) (C) (i) violation due to passage of time. In the absence of explicit statutory direction, an applicant's eligibility is determined under the statute in effect at the time his or her application is finally considered. See Matter of Soriano, 21 I&N Dec. 516 (BIA 1996, A.G. 1997).

If an amendment makes the statute more restrictive after the application is filed, the eligibility is determined under the terms of the amendment. Conversely, if the amendment makes the statute more generous, the application must be considered by more generous terms. Matter of George and Lopez-Alvarez, 11 I&N Dec. 419 (BIA 1965); Matter of Leveque, 12 I&N Dec. 633 (BIA 1968).

In 1986, Congress expanded the reach of the ground of inadmissibility in the Immigration Marriage Fraud Amendments of 1986, P.L. No. 99-639, § 6(a), 100 Stat. 3537, redesignated as § 212(a) (6) (C) of the Act by the Immigration Act of 1990 (Pub. L. No. 101-649, Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 5067). In 1986, Congress imposed the statutory bar on (a) those who made oral or written misrepresentations in seeking admission into the United States; (b) those who have made material misrepresentations in seeking entry admission into the United States or "other benefits" provided under the Act; and (c) it made the amended statute applicable to the receipt of visas by, and the admission of, aliens occurring after the date of the enactment based on fraud or misrepresentation occurring before, on, or after such date. This feature of the 1986 Act renders an alien perpetually inadmissible based on past misrepresentations.

In 1990, § 274C of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1324c, was inserted by the Immigration Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-649, Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 5059), effective for persons or entities that have committed violations on or after November 29, 1990. Section 274C(a) provided penalties for document fraud stating that it is unlawful for any person or entity knowingly-

(2) to use, attempt to use, possess, obtain, accept, or receive or to provide any forged, counterfeit, altered, or falsely made document in order to satisfy any requirement of this Act, ... (or to obtain a benefit under

this Act). The latter portion was added in 1996 by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA).

In 1994 Congress passed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (P.L. 103-322, September 13, 1994), which enhanced the criminal penalties of certain offenses, including 18 U.S.C. 1546:

(a)...Impersonation in entry document or admission application; evading or trying to evade immigration laws using assumed or fictitious name...knowingly making false statement under oath about material fact in immigration application or document....

(b) Knowingly using false or unlawfully issued document or false attestation to satisfy the Act provision on verifying whether employee is authorized to work.

The penalty for a violation under (a) increased from up to 5 years imprisonment and a fine or both to up to 10 years imprisonment and a fine or both. The penalty for a violation under (b) increased from up to 2 years imprisonment or a fine or both to up to 5 years imprisonment or a fine, or both.

To recapitulate, the applicant obtained a Philippine passport in an assumed name and date of birth and was aware of that fact while at the Manila International airport. Nevertheless, she traveled to the United States and used that document to procure admission into the United States in April 1997 as a nonimmigrant visitor because she wanted to work in the United States. She also applied for and was granted an extension of temporary stay based on that document. A violation of 18 U.S.C. 1546 is a felony.

In 1996, Congress expanded the document fraud liability to those who engage in document fraud for the purpose of obtaining a benefit under the Act. Congress also restricted § 212(i) of the Act in a number of ways with the recent IIRIRA amendments. First, immigrants who are parents of U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident children can no longer apply for this waiver. Second, the immigrant must now show that refusing him or her admission would cause extreme hardship to the qualifying relative. Third, Congress eliminated the alternative 10-year provision for immigrants who failed to have qualifying relatives. Fourth, Congress eliminated judicial review of § 212(i) waiver decisions, and Fifth, a child is no longer a qualifying relative.

After reviewing the amendments to the Act and to other statutes regarding fraud and misrepresentation from 1957 to the present time, and after noting the increased penalties Congress has placed on such activities, including the narrowing of the parameters for eligibility, the re-inclusion of the perpetual bar and eliminating children as a consideration in determining the presence of extreme hardship, it is concluded that Congress has placed a high priority on reducing and/or stopping fraud and misrepresentation related to immigration and other matters.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from § 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. Although extreme hardship is a requirement for § 212(i) relief, once established, it is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. See Matter of Mendez, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, Interim Decision 3380 (BIA 1999), the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) stipulated that the factors deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to § 212(i) of the Act include, but are not limited to, the following: 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 finally, significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, the Board also held that the underlying fraud or misrepresentation may be considered as an adverse factor in adjudicating a § 212(i) waiver application in the exercise of discretion. Matter of Tijam, Interim Decision 3372 (BIA 1998), followed. The Board declined to follow the policy set forth by the Commissioner in Matter of Alonso, 17 I&N Dec. 292 (Comm. 1979); Matter of Da Silva, 17 I&N Dec. 288 (Comm. 1979), and noted that the United States Supreme Court ruled in INS v. Yueh-Shaic Yang, 519 U.S. 26 (1996), that the Attorney General has the authority to consider any and all negative factors, including the respondent's initial fraud.

In Perez v. INS, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), the court stated that "extreme hardship" is hardship that is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. The common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship.

The court held in INS v. Jong Ha Wang, 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has failed to show that the qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship over and above the normal economic, emotional and social disruptions involved in the removal of a family member.

The grant or denial of the above waiver does not turn only on the issue of the meaning of "extreme hardship." It also hinges on the discretion of the Attorney General and pursuant to such terms, conditions, and procedures as she may by regulations prescribe.

It is noted that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in Carnalla-Muñoz v. INS, 627 F.2d 1004 (9th Cir. 1980), held that an after-

acquired equity (referred to as an after-acquired family tie in Matter of Tijam, Interim Decision 3372 (BIA 1998)), need not be accorded great weight by the district director in considering discretionary weight. The applicant in the present matter entered the United States in 1997 by fraud and married her spouse in 1999. She now seeks relief based on that after-acquired equity.

The favorable factors include the applicant's family tie and general hardship to the qualifying relative.

The unfavorable factors include the applicant's procuring admission into the United States by fraud, applying for and receiving an immigration benefit by fraud and her unauthorized stay in the United States.

The Board stated in Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, that United States Supreme Court ruled in INS v. Yueh-Shaio Yang, that the Attorney General has the authority to consider any and all negative factors, including the alien's initial fraud, in deciding whether or not to grant a favorable exercise of discretion. The Associate Commissioner does not deem it improper to give less weight in a discretionary matter to an alien's marriage which was entered into in the United States following a fraudulent entry and after a period of unlawful residence in the United States as opposed to a marriage entered into abroad followed by a fraudulent entry.

In the latter scenario the alien who marries abroad legitimately gains an equity or family tie which may result in his or her obtaining an immigrant visa and entering the United States lawfully even though the alien may fraudulently enter the United States after the marriage and before obtaining the visa. Whereas in the former scenario the alien who marries after he or she fraudulently enters the United States and resides without Service authorization does gain an after-acquired equity or family tie that he or she was not entitled to without the perpetration of the fraud.

Notwithstanding that the decision in Carnalla-Muñoz v. INS, related to an alien in removal or deportation proceedings, the alien's equity was gained subsequent to a violation of an immigration law, and when considering an issue as a matter of discretion an equity gained contrary to law should receive less weight than an equity gained through legal and legitimate means.

The applicant's actions in this matter cannot be condoned. The unfavorable factors in this matter outweigh the favorable ones. In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under § 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. See Matter of T-S-Y-, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.