U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

H2

FILE: Office: PORTLAND, OREGON Date: FEB 11 2004

IN RE: Applicant:

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Portland, Oregon, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) 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 pursuant to 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 the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative filed by his U.S. citizen spouse. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), so that he may reside with his U.S. citizen spouse in the United States.

The District Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed upon his qualifying family member. The application was denied accordingly. *See District Director's Decision* dated January 21, 2003.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now known as Citizenship and Immigration Services, "CIS") misapplied the extreme hardship standard set forth in section 212(h) of the Act, and that the evidence in the record establishes extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse.

Section 212(a)(2) of the Act states in pertinent part, that:

> (A)(i) [A]ny 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) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

> (h) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security, "Secretary"] may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraphs (A)(i)(I) . . . of subsection (a)(2) . . . if -
>
> . . . .
>
> > (1) (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 [Secretary] 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 . . . .

The record reflects that the applicant has one conviction of burglary three convictions for theft and one conviction for public excretion. The applicant is inadmissible to the United States due to his conviction of crimes involving moral turpitude (theft and burglary).

Section 212(h) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 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. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

In the present case, the applicant must demonstrate extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse.

On appeal, the applicant requested 30 days in which to present new evidence to show that extreme hardship would be imposed upon his spouse. It has been nearly a year and no new evidence has been added to the record. The decision will therefore be made based on the record as it currently stands. The applicant states that his spouse had previously submitted evidence that shows that his removal from the United States would impose extreme hardship to his spouse. The record reflects a letter from the applicant's spouse that describes their relationship and the fact that the applicant assisted her to become drug free but does not mention what hardship she would suffer if the applicant's waiver application were to be denied.

U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). For example, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined "extreme hardship" as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *Hassan v. INS, supra,* held further that 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. The U.S. Supreme Court additionally 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 his U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he were removed from the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(h) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.