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

PUBLIC COPY

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted [illegible]onal privacy

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

H2

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: DENVER, CO Date: NOV 23 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: SELF-REPRESENTED

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 Interim District Director, Denver, Colorado, 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 naturalized 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.

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 August 25, 2003.

On appeal, the applicant states that he and his spouse are expecting a child and send money to the applicant's family in Mexico on a monthly basis. The applicant states that he has continually improved the quality of his life since meeting his wife and has successfully complied with all of the requirements levied against him as a result of his criminal convictions. The applicant states the he volunteers in his community and is a law-abiding citizen. *Letter from Jesus Romero-Hernandez*, dated September 23, 2003.

In support of these assertions, the applicant submits a purchase agreement for a home purchased by the applicant and his spouse and a certificate of completion issued to the applicant.

The record reflects that the applicant has a criminal record involving multiple arrests in the state of Colorado between 1993 and 2002.[1] The applicant fails to provide documentation evidencing the resolution of some of his arrests, a deficiency noted in the decision of the interim district director. The AAO notes that some of the applicant's convictions for which disposition documents have been submitted qualify as crimes involving moral turpitude.[2]

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.

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] The applicant's criminal record is detailed in the decision of the interim district director.

[2] During November 1996, the applicant was arrested and pled guilty to Harassment and Domestic Violence. During June 1997, the applicant was arrested and pled guilty to Third Degree Assault and Criminal Mischief. During January 1998, the applicant was arrested and pled guilty to Criminal Impersonation: Unlawfully Benefiting.

. . . .

> (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.

On appeal, the applicant fails to provide evidence relevant to a consideration of hardship under the standard outlined in *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*. The applicant states that he sends money to his family in Mexico and will be unable to do so if he is removed from the United States. *Letter from Jesus Romero-Hernandez.* The AAO notes that the unidentified family members of the applicant in Mexico are not qualifying relatives for purposes of waiver proceedings under section 212(h) of the Act. The applicant further asserts that he has been rehabilitated from criminal behavior and is now an asset to his community. *Id.* The AAO notes, however, that a weighing of the equities in the application is not reached in the absence of a determination of extreme hardship. The record fails to demonstrate that the applicant's spouse suffers extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility to 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 will likely endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, her

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 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.