identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

H2

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: AUG 27 2010

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:

[redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

[redacted]

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Director, California Service Center. 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 Cuba 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 crimes involving moral turpitude. 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 lawful permanent resident mother.

In a decision dated March 6, 2008, the director found that the applicant failed to demonstrate that his lawful permanent resident mother would suffer extreme hardship as a result of his inadmissibility to the United States. The application was denied accordingly.

In a brief dated May 7, 2008, counsel states that the medical records and affidavit submitted by the applicant's mother indicate that she relies on her son on a daily basis. Counsel states that without her son, the applicant's mother would probably have to rely on public services. Counsel also states that the age of the applicant at the time of his conviction and the fact that the applicant has had no other problems with the law were not afforded consideration in the director's decision.

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

> (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.
>
> (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 Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) held in *Matter of Perez-Contreras*, 20 I&N Dec. 615, 617-18 (BIA 1992), that:

> [M]oral turpitude is a nebulous concept, which refers generally to conduct that shocks the public conscience as being inherently base, vile, or depraved, contrary to the rules of morality and the duties owed between man and man, either one's fellow man or society in general....
>
> In determining whether a crime involves moral turpitude, we consider whether the act is accompanied by a vicious motive or corrupt mind. Where knowing or intentional conduct is an element of an offense, we have found moral turpitude to be present. However, where the required mens rea may not be determined from the statute, moral turpitude does not inhere.

(Citations omitted.)

In the recently decided *Matter of Silva-Trevino*, 24 I&N Dec. 687 (A.G. 2008), the Attorney General articulated a new methodology for determining whether a conviction is a crime involving moral turpitude where the language of the criminal statute in question encompasses conduct involving moral turpitude and conduct that does not. First, in evaluating whether an offense is one that categorically involves moral turpitude, an adjudicator reviews the criminal statute at issue to determine if there is a "realistic probability, not a theoretical possibility," that the statute would be applied to reach conduct that does not involve moral turpitude. *Id.* at 698 (citing *Gonzalez v. Duenas-Alvarez*, 549 U.S. 183, 193 (2007). A realistic probability exists where, at the time of the proceeding, an "actual (as opposed to hypothetical) case exists in which the relevant criminal statute was applied to conduct that did not involve moral turpitude. If the statute has not been so applied in any case (including the alien's own case), the adjudicator can reasonably conclude that all convictions under the statute may categorically be treated as ones involving moral turpitude." *Id.* at 697, 708 (citing *Duenas-Alvarez*, 549 U.S. at 193).

However, if a case exists in which the criminal statute in question was applied to conduct that does not involve moral turpitude, "the adjudicator cannot categorically treat all convictions under that statute as convictions for crimes that involve moral turpitude." 24 I&N Dec. at 697 (citing *Duenas-Alvarez*, 549 U.S. at 185-88, 193). An adjudicator then engages in a second-stage inquiry in which the adjudicator reviews the "record of conviction" to determine if the conviction was based on conduct involving moral turpitude. *Id.* at 698-699, 703-704, 708. The record of conviction consists of documents such as the indictment, the judgment of conviction, jury instructions, a signed guilty plea, and the plea transcript. *Id.* at 698, 704, 708.

If review of the record of conviction is inconclusive, an adjudicator then considers any additional evidence deemed necessary or appropriate to resolve accurately the moral turpitude question. 24 I&N Dec. at 699-704, 708-709. However, this "does not mean that the parties would be free to present any and all evidence bearing on an alien's conduct leading to the conviction. (citation omitted). The sole purpose of the inquiry is to ascertain the nature of the prior conviction; it is not an invitation to relitigate the conviction itself." *Id.* at 703.

The record shows that the applicant was arrested in Marion County, Florida on July 19, 2001. On December 14, 2002, the applicant was convicted of grand theft under Florida Statutes § 812.014(1) and 812.014(2)(a), burglary of a conveyance under Florida Statutes § 812.02, possession of burglary tools under Florida Statutes § 812.06, and criminal mischief under Florida Statutes § 806.13(1)(a) and 806.13(1)(b)(2). The applicant, who was born on January 3, 1982, was 20 years old at the time he committed the acts that resulted in his arrest. As a result of these convictions the applicant was imprisoned for 31 months and placed on probation for three years.

At the time of the applicant's conviction, Florida Statutes § 812.014 provided:

> (1) A person commits theft if he or she knowingly obtains or uses, or endeavors to obtain or to use, the property of another with intent to, either temporarily or permanently:
>
> > (a) Deprive the other person of a right to the property or a benefit from the property.
> >
> > (b) Appropriate the property to his or her own use or to the use of any person not entitled to the use of the property.

U.S. Courts have held that the crime of theft or larceny, whether grand or petty, involves moral turpitude. See *Matter of Scarpulla*, 15 I&N Dec. 139, 140 (BIA 1974)(stating, "It is well settled that theft or larceny, whether grand or petty, has always been held to involve moral turpitude . . ."); *Morasch v. INS*, 363 F.2d 30, 31 (9th Cir. 1966)(stating, "Obviously, either petty or grand larceny, i.e., stealing another's property, qualifies [as a crime involving moral turpitude].") However, the BIA has indicated that a conviction for theft is considered to involve moral turpitude only when a permanent taking is intended. *Matter of Grazley*, 14 I&N Dec. 330 (BIA 1973). The AAO notes that the Arrest Affidavit/First Appearance Form for the applicant's conviction states that he was arrested attempting to steal a semi-tractor and cargo trailer which he stated he intended to take to Miami and sell. Thus, the AAO finds that in committing theft under Florida Statutes § 812.014 the applicant intended to permanently deprive the owner of his or her property.

The record also shows that the applicant was arrested on June 6, 2002 in Marion County, Florida and convicted of Forgery of a Credit Card Receipt under Florida Statutes § 831.01, Utter a Fraudulent Use of a Credit Card under Florida Statutes § 817.60, and Possession of Unauthorized Florida Drivers License under Florida Statutes § 322.212(1). The AAO notes that any crime involving fraud is a crime involving moral turpitude. *Burr v. INS*, 350 F.2d 87, 91 (9th Cir. 1965), *cert denied*, 383 U.S. 915 (1966). In addition, courts have found that forgery is a crime involving moral turpitude. *Matter of Seda*, 17 I. & N. Dec. 550 (BIA 1980), Georgia; *Animashaun v. INS*, 990 F.2d 234 (5th Cir. 1993), Alabama Criminal Code; *Balogun v. Ashcroft*, 270 F.3d 274 (5th Cir. 2001); *Morales-Carrera v. Ashcroft*, 74 F.3d Appx. 324 (5th Cir. 2003).

Therefore, the AAO finds that the applicant's convictions for grand theft, forgery of a credit card receipt, and fraudulent use of a credit card are convictions for crimes involving moral turpitude.

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), (B), . . . of subsection (a)(2) . . . if –
>
> . . . .
>
> (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 relative that qualifies is the applicant's mother. Hardship to the applicant is not relevant under the statute and will be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. If extreme hardship is established, the Secretary then assesses whether an exercise of discretion is warranted.

As a qualifying relative is not required to depart the United States as a consequence of an applicant's inadmissibility, two distinct factual scenarios are possible should a waiver application be denied: either the qualifying relative will join the applicant to reside abroad or the qualifying relative will remain in the United States. Ascertaining the actual course of action to be taken is difficult, and it is complicated by the fact that an applicant may easily assert a plan for the qualifying relative to relocate abroad or to remain in the United States depending on which scenario presents the greatest prospective hardship, even though no intention exists to carry out the alleged plan in reality. *Cf. Matter of Ige,* 20 I&N Dec. 880, 885 (BIA 1994) (addressing separation of minor child from both parents applying for suspension of deportation). Thus, we interpret the statutory language of the various waiver provisions in section 212 of the Act to require an applicant to establish extreme hardship to his or her qualifying relative(s) under both possible scenarios. To endure the hardship of separation when extreme hardship could be avoided by joining the applicant abroad, or to endure the hardship of relocation when extreme hardship could be avoided by remaining in the United States, is a matter of choice and not the result of removal or inadmissibility. As the Board stated in *Matter of Ige*:

> [W]e consider the critical issue . . . to be whether a child would suffer extreme hardship if he accompanied his parent abroad. If, as in this case, no hardship would ensue, then the fact that the child might face hardship if left in the United States would be the result of parental choice, not the parent's deportation.

Id. See also Matter of Pilch, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996).

Extreme hardship is "not a definable term of fixed and inflexible content or meaning," but "necessarily depends upon the facts and circumstances peculiar to each case." *Matter of Hwang*, 10 I&N Dec. 448, 451 (BIA 1964). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez,* 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-66 (BIA 1999), the Board 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. *Id.* The Board added that not all of the foregoing factors need be analyzed in any given case and emphasized that the list of factors was not exclusive. *Id.* at 566.

The Board has also held that the common or typical results of deportation, removal and inadmissibility do not constitute extreme hardship, and has listed certain individual hardship factors considered common rather than extreme. These factors include: economic disadvantage, loss of current employment, inability to maintain one's present standard of living, inability to pursue a chosen profession, separation from family members, severing community ties, cultural readjustment after living in the United States for many years, cultural adjustment of qualifying relatives who have never lived outside the United States, inferior economic and educational opportunities in the foreign country, or inferior medical facilities in the foreign country. *See generally Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 568; *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. at 631-32; *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 883; *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246-47 (Comm'r 1984); *Matter of Kim*, 15 I&N Dec. 88, 89-90 (BIA 1974); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810, 813 (BIA 1968).

However, though hardships may not be extreme when considered abstractly or individually, the Board has made it clear that "[r]elevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists." *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (quoting *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 882). The adjudicator "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." *Id.*

We observe that the actual hardship associated with an abstract hardship factor such as family separation, economic disadvantage, cultural readjustment, et cetera, differs in nature and severity depending on the unique circumstances of each case, as does the cumulative hardship a qualifying relative experiences as a result of aggregated individual hardships. *See, e.g., In re Bing Chih Kao* [redacted] (distinguishing *Matter of Pilch* regarding hardship faced by qualifying relatives on the basis of variations in the length of residence in the United States and the ability to speak the language of the country to which they would relocate).

The record of hardship includes: counsel's brief, a letter from counsel, a note from the applicant's mother's doctor, medical records for the applicant's mother, and a statement from the applicant's mother.

In a brief dated May 7, 2008, counsel states that family separation in the applicant's case amounts to extreme hardship because the applicant's mother suffers from peripheral neuropathy, lower back pain, leg pain, anxiety, depression, nocturia, poor vision, and diabetes. Counsel states that the applicant's mother relies on the applicant on a daily basis and would have to rely on public services in his absence.

In a letter dated March 27, 2008, the applicant's mother's doctor, [redacted], states that the applicant's mother has been his patient since March 14, 2008 and that she has been diagnosed with peripheral neuropathy, lower back pain, leg pain, anxiety, depression, nocturia, poor vision, and uncontrollable '[redacted]. The AAO notes that the record also contains various medical reports for the applicant's mother which seem to be the results of blood work, but no explanation was submitted with the reports.

In a brief dated July 29, 2007, counsel states that if the applicant were removed to Cuba, the applicant's mother would have to relocate with him as he is the only person upon whom she can rely for care. Counsel states that the applicant helps his mother around the house, with her medicines, and with her treatment. Counsel states that in Cuba the applicant's mother will not have access to the care she needs and her health will be at risk as a result.

In an affidavit dated July 18, 2007, the applicant's mother states that the applicant is the only relative she has in the United States and that he lives with her. She states that she suffers from diabetes and that her son helps her to cope with her illness. She states that he helps her to measure her blood sugar to control her illness and that he also takes her to medical appointments, helps her with cleaning the house and with her diet. She states that because her illness often keeps her from working she also relies on her son financially. The applicant's mother also states that if her son is removed to Cuba she will relocate to be with him and that in Cuba she will not have access to the medical care or food she needs to control her illness.

The AAO acknowledges that every qualifying relative will experience hardship as a result of their family member being found inadmissible, but to qualify for a waiver under section 212(h) of the Act the applicant must show that this hardship rises to the level of extreme hardship. To show extreme hardship the applicant must detail the hardship experienced by his qualifying relative and submit documentation supporting the hardship. The AAO notes that although the applicant's mother details the hardship she will experience she does not provide supporting documentation of these hardship claims. A letter from her doctor was submitted, but the letter only lists the applicant's mother's illness and does not describe the kind of treatment she is getting for these problems and the kind of everyday care she requires as a result of these problems. Furthermore, the applicant must show that his mother will suffer extreme hardship as a result of separation and as a result of relocating to Cuba to be with the applicant. The applicant's mother asserts that in Cuba she will not have access to the right medical care and food to control her diabetes, but does not submit any documentation to support the statements regarding country conditions in Cuba. The applicant also failed to submit evidence of the financial support he gives to his mother. 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)). Thus, the AAO must find that the current record does not establish that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility.

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.