



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

HI

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



File: [Redacted] Office: LOS ANGELES, CA

Date: **MAR 12 2001**

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

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

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



Public Copy

Identification 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

Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Los Angeles, 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 Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under § 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(I), for having been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant is married to a lawful permanent resident of the United States and is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative. He seeks a waiver of this permanent bar to admission as provided under § 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(h), to reside in the United States with his spouse and children.

The district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed upon qualifying relatives and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, counsel argues that in rendering its decision, the Service failed to acknowledge recent case law which provides guidelines for adjudicating hardship waivers. Counsel cites Matter of Ige, 20 I&N, Dec. 880 (BIA 1994) and Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, Interim Decision 3380 (BIA 1999) as holding that relevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists. Counsel asserts that considering the totality of circumstances, the applicant has demonstrated that his removal from the United States would constitute an extreme hardship to his lawful permanent resident spouse and two United States citizen children.

The record reflects that the applicant was convicted in California of corporal injury on a spouse in December 1992 and of assault with a deadly weapon and corporal injury on a spouse in September 1994. These violations arose out of two incidents of domestic violence by the applicant against his spouse. His punishment for each offense included two years of probation and completion of a one year course of domestic violence counseling. Counsel claims that the record of the first convictions have been expunged.

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

(2) CRIMINAL AND RELATED GROUNDS.-

(A) CONVICTION OF CERTAIN CRIMES.-

(i) IN GENERAL.-Except as provided in clause (ii),

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, is inadmissible.

Section 212(h) WAIVER OF SUBSECTION (a)(2)(A)(i)(I),...-The Attorney General may, in his discretion, waive application of subparagraph (A)(i)(I),...if-

(1)(A) in the case of any immigrant it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that-

(i)...the activities for which the alien is inadmissible occurred more than 15 years before the date of the alien's application for a visa, admission, or adjustment of status,

(ii) the admission to the United States of such alien would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security of the United States, and

(iii) the alien has been rehabilitated; or

(B) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse, parent, son, or daughter of a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the alien's denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to the United States citizen or lawfully resident spouse, parent, son, or daughter of such alien; and

(2) the Attorney General, in his discretion, and pursuant to such terms, conditions and procedures as he may by regulations prescribe, has consented to the alien's applying or reapplying for a visa, for admission to the United States, or for adjustment of status.

No waiver shall be provided under this subsection in the case of an alien who has been convicted of (or who has admitted committing acts that constitute) murder or criminal acts involving torture, or an attempt or conspiracy to commit murder or a criminal act involving torture. No waiver shall be granted under this subsection in the case of an alien who has previously been admitted to the United States as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if either since the date of such

admission the alien has been convicted of an aggravated felony or the alien has not lawfully resided continuously in the United States for a period of not less than 7 years immediately preceding the date of initiation of proceedings to remove the alien from the United States. No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision of the Attorney General to grant or deny a waiver under this subsection.

Here, fewer than 15 years have elapsed since the applicant committed his last violation. Therefore, he is ineligible for the waiver provided by § 212(h) (1) (A) of the Act.

Section 212(h) (1) (B) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from inadmissibility under § 212(a) (2) (A) (i) (I) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. The key term in the provision is "extreme." Therefore, only in cases of great actual or prospective injury to the qualifying relative(s) will the bar be removed. Common results of the bar, such as separation or financial difficulties, in themselves, are insufficient to warrant approval of an application unless combined with much more extreme impacts. Matter of Ngai, 19 I&N Dec. 245 (Comm. 1984). "Extreme hardship" to an alien himself cannot be considered in determining eligibility for a § 212(h) waiver of inadmissibility. Matter of Shaughnessy, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968).

On appeal, counsel contends that the applicant's spouse and children would face insurmountable cultural and social adjustment problems if forced to return to Mexico with the applicant. However, the record reflects that the applicant's spouse is also a native and citizen of Mexico and did not immigrate to the United States until 1988 when she was 19 years old. In addition, both of her parents, as well as her husband's parents, continue to reside in Mexico.

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. Further, the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See also 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).

On appeal, counsel acknowledges that economic distress is not sufficient to constitute extreme hardship but states that should the applicant's spouse remain in the United States, her life would be significantly more difficult because the applicant makes twice the income of his spouse. Although the applicant's spouse is

employed, her lack of education and skills limit her ability to increase her income, which counsel indicates is currently well below the poverty level for a family of three.

The assertion of financial hardship to the applicant's wife advanced in the record is contradicted by the fact that, pursuant to § 213A of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1183a, and the regulations at 8 C.F.R. 213a, the person who files an application for an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status on or after December 19, 1997 must execute a Form I-864 (Affidavit of Support) which is legally enforceable in behalf of a beneficiary (the applicant) who is an immediate relative or a family-sponsored immigrant when an applicant applies for an immigrant visa. The statute and the regulations do not provide for an alien beneficiary to execute an affidavit of support in behalf of a U.S. citizen or resident alien petitioner.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, fails to establish the existence of hardship over and above the normal economic and social disruptions involved in the deportation of a family member that reaches the level of extreme as envisioned by Congress if the applicant is not allowed to remain in the United States. It is concluded that the applicant has not established the qualifying degree of hardship in this matter.

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. Since the applicant has failed to establish the existence of extreme hardship, no purpose would be served in discussing a favorable exercise of discretion at this time.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under § 212(h), the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Matter of Ngai, supra. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.