identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

#2

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: LOS ANGELES, CA Date: [illegible]

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, 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)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(II), for having been convicted of a crime involving a controlled substance. The applicant is married to a lawful permanent resident of the United States and is the parent of three citizens of the United States. He seeks a waiver under section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), in order to remain in the United States with his spouse and children.

The interim district director concluded that the applicant violated a law relating to a controlled substance and was therefore inadmissible to the United States. *Decision of the Interim District Director*, dated August 26, 2003.

On appeal, the applicant states that he made a terrible mistake, but since his arrest in 1988, the applicant indicates that he has been a law-abiding citizen and has provided for his family. The applicant contends that his absence from the United States would result in extreme emotional, psychological and physical hardship to his family and himself. *Letter from Arturo Gonzalez Vieyra*, dated September 15, 2003.

The record reflects that on May 3, 1988 in the Los Angeles Superior Court of California, the applicant was convicted of Sale/Furnish of Marijuana/Hashish.

Section 212(a)(2) of the Act states:

> (A)(i) In general. – Except as provided in clause (ii), any alien convicted of, or who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of –
>
> > (I) a violation of (or conspiracy or attempt to violate) any law or regulation of a State, the United States, or a foreign country relating to a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)), is inadmissible.

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

> The Attorney General [Secretary of Homeland Security] may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraph (A)(i)(I), (B), (D), and (E) or subsection (a)(2) and subparagraph (A)(i)(II) of such subsection insofar as it relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana . . .

The record reflects that the applicant was convicted of a drug offense other than "simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana." As indicated by the decision of the interim district director, the statute enacted by Congress does not provide for a waiver at the Secretary's discretion for the offense committed by the applicant.

Because the applicant is statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether the applicant has established extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen children or lawful permanent resident wife or 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.