

H2

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: LOS ANGELES, CA

Date: OCT 29 2004

IN RE:

[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)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Interim District Director, Los Angeles, California, 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 under 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), for having been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant is the spouse of a United States citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), so that he may reside in the United States with his spouse and children.

The interim district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Interim District Director*, dated June 30, 2003.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant's spouse is currently not working due to disability and is undergoing therapy. Counsel contends that separating the applicant from his family would constitute extreme hardship emotionally and financially. *Form I-290B*, dated July 29, 2003.

In support of these assertions, counsel submits a brief, dated August 28, 2003; two statements from physicians treating the applicant's spouse and a copy of a notice of unemployment insurance claim. The record also contains a declaration of the applicant's spouse, dated March 28, 2002. The entire record was considered in rendering this decision.

The record reflects that on March 23, 1999, the applicant was convicted of Fraud. Further, on January 5 and 7, 1996, the applicant was convicted on two separate counts of Theft.

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

(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 . . . or an attempt or conspiracy to commit such a crime . . . is inadmissible.

(ii) Exception – Clause (i)(I) shall not apply to an alien who committed only one crime if –

(I) the crime was committed when the alien was under 18 years of age, and the crime was committed . . . more than 5 years before the date of application for a visa or other documentation and the date of application for admission to the United States . . .

Section 212(h) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(h) The Attorney General [Secretary of Homeland Security] may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraph (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 . . .

A section 212(h) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(2)(A) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse, child or parent of the applicant. Any hardship suffered by the applicant himself is irrelevant to waiver proceedings under section 212(h) of the Act. 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).

*Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-566 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include 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 significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

Counsel makes no assertions regarding hardship to the applicant's spouse or children if they relocate to Mexico to remain with the applicant. Counsel contends that if the applicant's spouse and children remain in the United States in the absence of the applicant, they will suffer emotional and financial hardship. *Brief in Support of Appeal*, dated August 28, 2003. Counsel states that the applicant's spouse is unemployed and suffers from depression. *Id.* The record reflects that the applicant's spouse undergoes treatment for depression and anxiety. *Letter from [REDACTED] MD*, dated August 28, 2003. The record indicates that the applicant's spouse is prescribed medication to treat her condition and does not establish that she is unable to work as a result of her ailments. *Id.* Although counsel states that the applicant's spouse is disabled, the record reflects that the applicant's spouse has filed an unemployment insurance claim as a result of being laid off. *Notice*, dated April 4, 2003. The record fails to establish that the applicant's spouse is unable to work in order to financially provide for herself and her children in the absence of the applicant. The record fails to establish that the unemployment benefits that the applicant's spouse receives are insufficient to meet her expenditures. Further, despite the assertion of counsel that the applicant will earn only a fraction of his current salary in Mexico, the record fails to substantiate this claim and therefore, fails to establish that the applicant is unable to contribute financially to his family's well-being from a location outside of the United States.

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 AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse and children will likely endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, their situation, based on the record, is typical to individuals separated as a result of deportation or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse and/or children caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he 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. *See* 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.