H2

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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

[redacted]

File: [redacted] Office: COPENHAGEN, DENMARK Date: JAN 09 2003

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

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

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[redacted]

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision 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 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 that 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 that originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Officer in Charge, Copenhagen, Denmark, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native of Dutch Guyana, citizen of the Netherlands, and resident of Sweden who was found by a consular officer to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having sought to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is married to a United States citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative. She seeks the above waiver in order to travel to the United States to reside with her spouse.

The officer in charge concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed upon a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's misrepresentation, although wrong, and for which she has remorse and regret, was not material. In addition, counsel asserts that the applicant has established that her spouse and son will suffer more than extreme hardship if the waiver request is not granted.

The record reflects that a consular officer found the applicant ineligible for admission into the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act because she had made misrepresentations when seeking to procure admission into the United States on October 5, 1998.

The issue of inadmissibility is not the purpose of this proceeding. Issues of inadmissibility are to be determined by the consular officer when an alien applies for a visa abroad. This proceeding must be limited to the issue of whether or not the applicant meets the statutory and discretionary requirements necessary for the exclusion ground to be waived. 22 C.F.R. 42.81 contains the necessary procedures for overcoming the refusal of an immigrant visa by a consular officer.

Section 212(a) of the Act states:

> 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) of the Act states:

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).

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 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 section 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, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (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 section 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.

Documentation contained in the record reflects that the applicant and her spouse were married on July 20, 2001 in Stockholm, Sweden. The couple has one child, a son born in the United States in May 1998. The applicant's spouse has two United States citizen children, born in 1985 and 1988, from a prior marital relationship for whom he is required to provide child support until they reach the age of eighteen years.

According to statements provided by the applicant and her spouse contained in the record of proceeding, denial of the applicant's waiver request would result in a separation that would be both mentally and emotionally detrimental to them and their families. The applicant's spouse, prior to the couple's marriage, had attempted to live and work in Sweden but was unable to find suitable employment. The spouse states that by living in Sweden, he would be separated from his children from his prior marriage and would be unable to properly support his children from both marriages.

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.

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.

There are no laws that require the applicant's spouse and son to leave the United States and relocate 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 Shooshtary 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."

A review of all record fails to show that the qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship over and above the normal disruptions involved in separation from a family member. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be

served in discussing the favorable or unfavorable exercise of the Attorney General's discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 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.