**U.S. Department of Homeland Security**
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

**U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services**

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: GUANGZHOU, CHINA Date:

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 Officer in Charge, Guangzhou, China, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of China 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 parent 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 she may reside in the United States with her spouse and daughter.

The officer in charge 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 Officer in Charge*, dated June 25, 2002.

The record contains an INS Fee Authorization reflecting that the applicant was charged $195 for the Appeal for Waiver. The record also contains a receipt reflecting the same amount. The AAO notes that the authorized fee for the instant appeal is $110. The applicant shall be refunded any amount that she paid in excess of the $110 fee.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that her stepson causes trouble and engages in illegal activity and that she must leave China to escape him. *Additional Statement Concerning My Waiver Application*, dated August 15, 2002.

The record reflects that on January 13, 1995, the applicant was convicted of bribery under Chinese law. The applicant was sentenced to five years imprisonment for this violation. The applicant was paroled on December 31, 1996 for good behavior and her period of parole lasted until June 4, 1999.

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)(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 herself 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.

The applicant asserts that her stepson cheats and steals money from her and his father, the applicant's spouse. *Additional Statement Concerning My Waiver Application*, August 15, 2002. The applicant indicates that her stepson is responsible for her arrest and subsequent conviction and states that she was unaware that her behavior broke the law. *Id.* The applicant indicates that she is plagued by fear and grief as a result of the torment inflicted by her stepson who "set[s] up traps against [her]." *Id.* The applicant contends that she must leave China in order to escape her stepson's wrath. The applicant further states that her husband will not go the United States without her. She indicates that she is the only one familiar with his physical situation and if he relocates to the United States without her, there is a possibility that no one will care for him. *Memorandum Report of Interview of Ineligible Applicant for Immigrant Visa Who Is Applying for Relief Under Section 212(h) or (i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act*, dated May 8, 2000. The AAO notes that the record makes no assertions regarding hardship suffered by the applicant's United States citizen daughter as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. As noted previously, 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 herself is irrelevant to waiver proceedings under section 212(h) of the Act. The applicant states that she previously provided a statement and documents concerning the pain of living apart from her daughter. *Additional Statement Concerning My Waiver Application.* The AAO notes that the record on appeal does not contain a statement of the type indicated by the applicant.

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 daughter likely endures 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 child 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 she 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.