




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



H2

FILE:



Office: MIAMI, FL


Date: SEP 02 2009

IN RE:



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:



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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Miami, Florida, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Bahamas who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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 committed crimes involving moral turpitude. The applicant has a U.S. citizen wife and two U.S. citizen daughters. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), in order to remain in the United States with his family.

In a decision, dated January 9, 2007, the director found the applicant inadmissible for having been convicted of “Possession of Cannabis, under 20 grams” and “Resisting an Officer Without Violence.” The district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the waiver application accordingly.

In his brief, dated February 5, 2007, counsel states that the applicant’s wife will suffer extreme hardship as a result of his inadmissibility and that the applicant warrants a favorable exercise of discretion.

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

(A) Conviction of certain crimes. –

(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 crime involving moral turpitude (other than a purely political offense) or an attempt or conspiracy to commit such a crime, or

(II) 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.

(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 (and the alien was released from any confinement to a prison or correctional institution imposed for the crime) more than 5 years before the date of the application for a visa or other documentation and the date of application for admission to the United States, or

(II) the maximum penalty possible for the crime of which the alien was convicted (or which the alien admits having committed or of which the acts that the alien admits having committed constituted the essential elements) did not exceed imprisonment for one year and, if the alien was convicted of such crime, the alien was not sentenced to a term of imprisonment in excess of 6 months (regardless of the extent to which the sentence was ultimately executed).

The record indicates that the applicant was convicted on October 29, 2002 of Resisting an Officer Without Violence under Florida Statutes §843.02 and Possession of Cannabis (less than 20 grams) under Florida Statutes §893.13. Thus, the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) for being convicted of a violation related to a controlled substance. Because the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Act no purpose would be served in also discussing whether he is inadmissible in regards to his conviction for Resisting an Officer Without Violence. In addition, because the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Act he is not eligible for relief under section 212(a)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act.

However, the applicant is eligible to apply for a waiver under section 212(h) of the Act.

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

(h) The Attorney General 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.

....

(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

The AAO notes that section 212(h) of the Act provides that a waiver of inadmissibility is dependent first upon a showing that the bar to admission imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. In this case, the relatives that qualify are the applicant's spouse and two daughters. Hardship to the applicant is not considered under the statute it is shown that hardship to the applicant is resulting in hardship to a qualifying relative. If extreme hardship is established, the Secretary then assesses whether an exercise of discretion is warranted.

In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-66 (BIA 1999), the BIA provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. The 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 BIA added that not all of the foregoing factors need be analyzed in any given case and emphasized that the list of factors was not an exclusive list. *See id.*

Relevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists. In each case, the trier of fact must consider the entire range of factors concerning hardship in their totality and determine whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation. *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996). (Citations omitted).

The AAO notes that in *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that, “the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States”, and that, “[w]hen the BIA fails to give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship that will result from family separation, it has abused its discretion.” (Citations omitted). Although the present case did not arise in the Ninth Circuit, separation of family will be given appropriate weight in the assessment of hardship factors.

The AAO notes further, however, that 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, in *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), the BIA held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), the Court defined “extreme hardship” as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. The Court emphasized that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court 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.

An analysis under *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* is appropriate. The AAO notes that extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must be established in the event that she accompanies the applicant to the Bahamas and in the event that she remains in the United States, as a qualifying relative is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant’s waiver request.

The record of hardship includes a brief from counsel; a statement from the applicant’s spouse; copies of tax documentation; and copies of: the marriage certificate for the applicant and his spouse, birth certificates of the applicant’s daughters, and social security cards for the applicant’s spouse and daughter.

In his brief, dated February 5, 2007, counsel states that the applicant’s spouse is suffering extreme hardship because she is the only one supporting the family financially. He states that the applicant’s spouse’s employment provides medical care for the family and is the only source of income because the applicant is unable to work due to his not having an immigration status. Counsel also states that visiting the applicant in the Bahamas would not be a possibility because of the family’s financial constraints. Counsel states further that relocation to the Bahamas would mean that the applicant and his family would not have access to the medicine, employment and education that is available in the United States.

In a statement dated May 27, 2006 the applicant's spouse states that she is the sole breadwinner of the family and that this responsibility is a strain. She states that she has had three miscarriages and that when the applicant was able to work he made a great contribution to the family.

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that the hardships faced by the applicant's spouse and daughters, considered in the aggregate, rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. The record does not contain documentation to clearly show the applicant's spouse's financial situation or the country conditions in the Bahamas. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish eligibility for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(h) of the Act. 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 establishing that the application merits approval 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.