



AA

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

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



FILE



Office: Miami

Date:

MAY 29 2002

IN RE: Applicant:



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: Self-represented

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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

Helen E. Crawford for
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)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(I). The district director, therefore, concluded that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment of status and denied the application.

The applicant has provided no statement or additional evidence on notice of certification.

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....

The record reflects the following:

1. On January 21, 1999, in the Circuit Court of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, Dade County, Florida, [REDACTED] the applicant was found guilty of Count 1, aggravated assault with a deadly weapon; Count 2, aggravated stalking; Count 3, false imprisonment; Count 4, aggravated assault with a deadly weapon; Count 4, violation of injunction for protection against domestic violence; Count 5, violation of injunction for protection against domestic violence; Count 6, violation of injunction for protection against domestic violence; and Count 7, threatening phone calls. Adjudication of guilt was withheld and the applicant was placed on probation/community control for a period of 3 years and ordered to

pay court costs as to Counts 1 thru 4, and entry of sentence was suspended as to Counts 5 thru 7.

2. On June 14, 1996, in Dade County, Florida, [REDACTED] the applicant was arrested and charged with (1) burglary (unoccupied), (2) burglary (unoccupied), (3) burglary (unoccupied), and (4) grand theft. On July 5, 1996, a "no action" was entered on the case.

3. On June 2, 1998, in Dade County, Florida, [REDACTED] the applicant was arrested and charged with aggravated stalking. On June 23, 1998, a "no action" was entered on the case.

4. On July 9, 1998, in Dade County, Florida, [REDACTED] the applicant was arrested and charged with (1) violation of injunction for protection against domestic violence, and (2) aggravated stalking. On December 29, 1998, a "nolle pros" was entered on the case.

5. On August 16, 1998, in Dade County Florida [REDACTED] the applicant was arrested and charged with battery/violation of domestic violence injunction. On October 13, 1998, a "nolle pros" was entered on the case.

Aggravated assault (use of a deadly weapon) is a crime involving moral turpitude. Guillen-Garcia v. INS, 999 F.2d 199 (7th Cir. 1993); Matter of Goodalle, 12 I&N Dec. 106 (BIA 1967); Matter of Baker, 15 I&N Dec. 50 (BIA 1974). Further, aggravated stalking is a crime involving moral turpitude. Matter of Ajami, I.D. 3405 (BIA 1999). Likewise, spousal/domestic abuse is a crime involving moral turpitude. Grageda v. INS, 12 F.3d 919 (9th Cir. 1993) Calif. Penal Code 273.5(a) [willful infliction of an injury upon a spouse, cohabitant, or parent of the perpetrator's child is a based and depraved act and is classified as a CIMT.] See also Corporal injury of a spouse/California Penal Code 273.5(a). [California courts found this violation to include "cruel or inhuman corporal punishment or injury." This crime is a CIMT.] Tran, Int. Dec. 3271 (BIA 1996). The infliction of bodily harm upon a person with whom one has such a familial relationship is an act of depravity which is contrary to accepted moral standards.

The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act based on his convictions of crimes involving moral turpitude. 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. Further, the applicant is not the recipient of an approved waiver of such grounds of inadmissibility, nor is there evidence in the record that he is eligible to file for such a waiver.

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.