





U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)



DATE: JUN 14 2013


Office: OAKLAND PARK, FL

FILE: 

IN RE: 

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h).

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Oakland, Florida and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Jamaica 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 a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her U.S. citizen child.

In a decision dated April 27, 2012, the field office director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that her U.S. citizen daughter would suffer extreme hardship as a result of her inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's daughter will suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility as she cannot separate from her only guardian and she cannot relocate to Jamaica because of conditions there.

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-

....

(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.)

The applicant's case arises within the jurisdiction of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, which has recently reaffirmed the traditional categorical approach for determining whether a crime involves moral turpitude. *See Fajardo v. Attorney General*, 659 F.3d 1303, 1310 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2011) (finding that the Congress intended the traditional categorical or modified categorical approach to be used to determine whether convictions were convictions for crimes involving moral turpitude and declining to follow the "realistic probability approach" put forth by the Attorney General in *Matter of Silva-Trevino*, 24 I&N Dec. 687 (A.G. 2008)). In its decision, the Eleventh Circuit defined the categorical approach as "'looking only to the statutory definitions of the prior offenses, and not to the particular facts underlying those convictions.'" 659 F.3d at 1305 (quoting *Taylor v. United States*, 495 U.S. 575, 600 (1990)). The court indicated, however, that where the statutory definition of a crime includes "conduct that would categorically be grounds for removal as well as conduct that would not, then the record of conviction – i.e., the charging document, plea, verdict, and sentence – may also be considered." 659 F.3d at 1305 (citing *Jaggernaut v. U.S. Att'y Gen.*, 432 F.3d 1346, 1354-55 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005)).

The record indicates that on September 10, 2008, the applicant pled guilty to Grand Theft under § 812.014 of the Florida Statutes as a third degree felony. The applicant was sentenced to 18 months probation. The maximum sentence for a conviction under section 812.014 of the Florida Statutes is 5 years imprisonment.

At the time of the applicant's conviction, section 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.

A plain reading of Fl. Stat. § 812.014 shows that it can be violated by knowingly obtaining or using the property of another with intent to, either temporarily or permanently, deprive an individual of his or her property or appropriate the property to his or her own use. The BIA has determined that to constitute a crime involving moral turpitude, a theft offense must require the intent to permanently take another person's property. *See Matter of Grazley*, 14 I&N Dec. 330 (BIA 1973) ("Ordinarily, a conviction for theft is considered to involve moral turpitude only when a permanent taking is intended."). Therefore, the AAO cannot find that a violation of Fl. Stat. § 812.014 is categorically a crime involving moral turpitude.

Since the full range of conduct proscribed by the statute at hand does not constitute a crime involving moral turpitude, we will review the record of conviction to determine if the conviction was under the clause indicating a permanent taking or temporary taking. The Complaint in the applicant's case indicates that the applicant's crime was retail theft. In *In re Jurado-Delgado*, 24 I&N Dec. 29, 33-34 (BIA 2006), the BIA found that a violation of a Pennsylvania retail theft statute involved moral turpitude because the nature of retail theft is such that it is reasonable to assume such an offense would be committed with the intention of retaining merchandise permanently. The reasoning in *Jurado-Delgado* is applicable to the applicant's case. She was thus convicted of knowingly taking the property of another with intent to permanently deprive that person of the property, a crime involving moral turpitude, and is inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act.

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 . . . .

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(h) of the Act is dependent on a showing that the bar to admission imposes extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, which includes the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse, parent, son or daughter of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's daughter is the only qualifying relative in this case. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, the applicant is statutorily eligible for a waiver, and USCIS then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (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*, the Board provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). 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 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. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996); *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 883 (BIA 1994); *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.*

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., Matter of Bing Chih Kao and Mei Tsui Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45, 51 (BIA 2001) (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). For example, though family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal, separation from family living in the United States can also be the most important single hardship factor in considering hardship in the aggregate. *Salcido-Salcido v. I.N.S.*, 138 F.3d 1292

(9th Cir. 1998)(quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *but see Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247 (separation of spouse and children from applicant not extreme hardship due to conflicting evidence in the record and because applicant and spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years). Therefore, we consider the totality of the circumstances in determining whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

The record of hardship includes: counsel's brief, copies of studies regarding the best interest of the child in situations where a parent is unlawfully in the United States and either has been removed or faces removal, information on the Holmes and Rahe stress scale, country conditions information for Jamaica, a statement from the applicant, photographs, and educational documentation. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

The record indicates that the applicant is the beneficiary of an approved Form I-360 as a battered spouse and that she is the sole guardian of her five-year-old daughter. The applicant states that her daughter's father is unavailable, that they do not communicate, and he provides no financial support. The record does indicate that the applicant has several family members living in the United States including her mother, father, siblings, nieces, and nephews. The record does not demonstrate that in the event of separation, the applicant's daughter could not be cared for by other family members. However, we find that the applicant has shown that separating her daughter from her, with no other parent to care for her, would constitute extreme hardship.

We also find that the country conditions information and statements in the record support a finding that the applicant's daughter would suffer extreme hardship as a result of relocation. The record indicates that most of the applicant's family resides in the United States, with the exception of her brother and his family, who live in a rural part of Jamaica in an unfinished concrete house with no running water. Reports indicate that Jamaica is a very poor country as compared to the United States, that violent crime is a serious problem, medical care is limited, public education is not of the same standard as it is in the United States, and that it would be difficult for the applicant to find employment paying her a living wage.

In this case, the record contains sufficient evidence to show that the hardships faced by the applicant's daughter, considered in the aggregate, rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has established extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen daughter as required under section 212(h) of the Act.

Extreme hardship is a requirement for eligibility, but once established it is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). For waivers of inadmissibility, the burden is on the applicant to establish that a grant of a waiver of inadmissibility is warranted in the exercise of discretion. *Id.* at 299. The adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident must be balanced with the social and humane considerations presented on his behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of this country. *Id.* at 300.

The AAO notes that *Matter of Marin*, 16 I & N Dec. 581 (BIA 1978), involving a section 212(c) waiver, is used in waiver cases as guidance for balancing favorable and unfavorable factors and this cross application of standards is supported by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). In *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, the BIA, assessing the exercise of discretion under section 212(h) of the Act, stated:

We find this use of *Matter of Marin, supra*, as a general guide to be appropriate. For the most part, it is prudent to avoid cross application, as between different types of relief, of particular principles or standards for the exercise of discretion. *Id.* However, our reference to *Matter of Marin, supra*, is only for the purpose of the approach taken in that case regarding the balancing of favorable and unfavorable factors within the context of the relief being sought under section 212(h)(1)(B) of the Act. *See, e.g., Palmer v. INS*, 4 F.3d 482 (7th Cir.1993) (balancing of discretionary factors under section 212(h)). We find this guidance to be helpful and applicable, given that both forms of relief address the question of whether aliens with criminal records should be admitted to the United States and allowed to reside in this country permanently.

*Matter of Mendez-Moralez* at 300.

In *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, in evaluating whether section 212(h)(1)(B) relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the BIA stated that:

The factors adverse to the applicant include the nature and underlying circumstances of the exclusion ground at issue, the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws, the existence of a criminal record and, if so, its nature, recency and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of an alien's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country. . . . The favorable considerations include family ties in the United States, residence of long duration in this country (particularly where the alien began his residency at a young age), evidence of hardship to the alien and his family if he is excluded and deported, service in this country's Armed Forces, a history of stable employment, the existence of property or business ties, evidence of value and service to the community, evidence of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and other evidence attesting to the alien's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends, and responsible community representatives). .

*Id.* at 301.

The BIA further states that upon review of the record as a whole, a balancing of the equities and adverse matters must be made to determine whether discretion should be favorably exercised. The equities that the applicant for section 212(h)(1)(B) relief must bring forward to establish that he

merits a favorable exercise of administrative discretion will depend in each case on the nature and circumstances of the ground of exclusion sought to be waived and on the presence of any additional adverse matters, and as the negative factors grow more serious, it becomes incumbent upon the applicant to introduce additional offsetting favorable evidence. *Id.* at 301.

The favorable factors in the applicant's case include: the applicant's family ties to the United States, the hardship her daughter would face if she were to be prohibited from residing in the United States, the lack of a criminal record since 2008, the applicant's record of completing her probation and her high school diploma, the applicant's efforts in obtaining certification as a nursing assistant, her statements of regret for her actions, and, as evidenced by numerous letters in the record, the applicant's attributes as a supportive mother.

The unfavorable factor in the applicant's case consists of the applicant's criminal conviction.

Although the applicant's criminal record cannot be condoned, the positive factors in this case outweigh the negative factor. In these proceedings, the burden of establishing eligibility for the waiver rests entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In this case, the applicant has met her burden and the appeal will be sustained.

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. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained.