



A2

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identification 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



FILE: [Redacted]

Office: Miami

Date: 04 MAR 2004

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Permanent Residence Pursuant to Section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966 (P.L. 89-732)

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.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

*Robert P. Wiemann*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Associate Commissioner, Examinations, for review. The district director's decision will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Cuba who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966. This Act provides for the adjustment of status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959, and has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence.

The district director found the applicant inadmissible to the United States because he falls within the purview of section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(II). The district director, therefore, concluded that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment of status and denied the application.

In response to the notice of certification, counsel requests an extension of time in which to submit a brief or statement. However, it has been approximately seven months since the request for extension and neither a brief nor additional evidence has been received. Therefore, the record is considered complete.

Section 212(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2), provides that aliens inadmissible and ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States include:

(A)(i) Any alien convicted of, or who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of --

(I) a crime involving moral turpitude (other than a purely political offense) or an attempt or conspiracy to commit such a crime, or

(II) a violation of (or a conspiracy or attempt to violate) any law or regulation of a State, the United States, or a foreign country relating to a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. 802).

The record reflects the following:

1. On June 13, 1996, in Dade County, Florida, Case No. [REDACTED] the applicant entered a plea of guilty to Count 1, petit theft, and Count 2, possession of marijuana (under). He was found guilty of both Counts 1 and 2 and sentenced to credit for time served as to both counts.

2. On December 17, 2000, in Dade County, Florida, Case No. [REDACTED] the applicant was arrested and charged with Count 1, possession of cocaine, and Count 2, possession of marijuana. On January 8, 2001, the court entered a "no action" on the case.

Theft or larceny, whether grand or petty, is a crime involving moral turpitude. Matter of Scarpulla, 15 I&N Dec. 139 (BIA 1974); Morasch v. INS, 363 F.2d 30 (9th Cir. 1966). Section 212(a)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, however, provides for an exception to inadmissibility of an alien convicted of only one crime of moral turpitude, where the maximum penalty possible for the crime did not exceed imprisonment for one year and the alien was not sentenced to a term of imprisonment in excess of six months (regardless of the extent to which the sentence was ultimately executed). Pursuant to Florida Statute 812.014(1)(d), petit theft is a misdemeanor of the second degree punishable by a term of imprisonment not exceeding 60 days. In this case, the applicant was sentenced to credit for time served. He, therefore, qualifies for this exception under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act.

The applicant, however, is inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Act based on his conviction of possession of marijuana (paragraph 2 above). While a waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under this section is available to an alien convicted of a single offense of simple possession of thirty grams or less of marijuana, the district director noted that the applicant did not possess the prerequisite family relationship to apply for a waiver of inadmissibility.

The applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the district director's findings. No additional evidence has been entered into the record of proceeding.

The applicant is ineligible for adjustment of status to permanent residence pursuant to section 1 of the Act of November 2, 1966. The decision of the district director to deny the application will be affirmed.

**ORDER:** The district director's decision is affirmed.