

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

A12

FILE:

Office: LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Date: JAN 10 2005

IN RE:

LUIS CARDENAS

APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under § 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.

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 District Director, Los Angeles, California. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who entered the United States on December 11, 1979 and was admitted as a visitor with authorization to remain until June 12, 1980. In 1994 the applicant was convicted of burglary and was sentenced to 90 days in jail and three years of probation. The applicant 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 record indicates that the applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and that he is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside with his wife and children in the United States.

The district director found that, based on the evidence in the record, the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse and children. The application was denied accordingly. On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's wife and two children will face extreme hardship if the applicant is removed to Mexico, because he is the primary wage earner, and they would not be able to afford their current home without his income. Counsel also maintains that the applicant's wife and children cannot move to Mexico, because they have no familial ties in that country.

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

- (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) states in pertinent part that:

- (h) The Attorney General may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraphs (A)(i)(I) . . . of subsection (a)(2) . . . if-
  - (1)(A) [I]t is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that-
    - (i) [T]he 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.

The applicant was convicted of burglary in 1994, less than 15 years prior to the adjudication of his application for adjustment of status. The applicant is therefore statutorily ineligible for a waiver pursuant to § 212(h)(1)(A) of the Act. He is however, eligible to apply for a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to § 212(h)(B) of the Act.

In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999) the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship. These factors included 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.

U.S. court decisions have additionally held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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.

On appeal, counsel states that if the applicant is removed, the applicant's wife will probably not be able to pay their mortgage, and she will have to move. Unfortunately, such an occurrence is not an extreme outcome of a removal; rather, it can be considered a common adjustment to such a change in family circumstances. In fact, the AAO notes that the U.S. Supreme Court has 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.

Counsel also maintains that the applicant's wife and children could not adjust to life in Mexico. Although counsel notes that the applicant's wife and children, the eldest of whom is eight years old, were born in the United States and have spent little, if any, time in this country, the record does not reflect that they speak no Spanish or that it would be otherwise extremely difficult for them to make the transition.

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 and children would suffer hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon removal. 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.