

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

[REDACTED]

H2

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA

Date: **JAN 08 2010**

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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


ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

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).


Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Miami, Florida. 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 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 been convicted of a crime 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 reside with his U.S. citizen wife and children in the United States.

The district director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated April 4, 2007.

The record contains, *inter alia*: a copy of the marriage certificate of the applicant and his wife, indicating they were married on August 2, 2002; a copy of naturalization certificate; copies of birth certificates for the couple's two U.S. citizen children; copies of tax documents; and copies of conviction documents. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision on the appeal.

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 (other than a purely political offense) 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 [now, Secretary, Homeland Security, "Secretary"] may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraphs (A)(i)(I) . . . 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 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

In the instant case, the record shows that the applicant entered the United States in January 1993 as a parolee. The record further indicates that on December 18, 1996, the applicant was convicted in the Circuit Court of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit in and for Dade County, Florida, of resisting an officer with violence, battery on a law enforcement officer, aggravated battery, and false imprisonment, and was sentenced to two years probation. The district director found, and counsel concedes, that the applicant is inadmissible for having committed a crime involving moral turpitude. *Attachment to Form I-290B* (“The Petitioner’s criminal convictions are all crimes of moral turpitude. . . .”). Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A).

A section 212(h) waiver is dependent upon a showing that the bar to admission imposes an extreme hardship on the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse, parent, son, or daughter of the applicant. 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-Morales*, 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 under 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.

In this case, there is insufficient evidence that the applicant’s wife or children would suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant’s waiver application being denied.

Significantly, there are no statements, affidavits, or letters in the record from either the applicant or his wife, [REDACTED]. Counsel contends that the applicant’s “wife and children depend emotionally, psychologically and financially on the [applicant, and that w]ithout the [applicant’s] financial contributions the family would lose their home and more likely than not have to receive government assistance.” *Attachment to Form I-290B*. However, 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 recognizes [REDACTED] and the couple’s children will experience hardship as a result of the applicant’s waiver application being denied and is sympathetic to the family’s circumstances. However, their situation is typical of individuals separated as a result of deportation or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. The Board of Immigration Appeals and the Courts of Appeals have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are

insufficient to prove extreme hardship. 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. *See also Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991) (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).

To the extent counsel makes a financial hardship claim, although the record contains copies of tax documents, the applicant has not submitted sufficient evidence to show that the level of hardship is extreme. Aside from a 2005 tax assessment for the couple's condominium, there is no documentation regarding the family's expenses, such as mortgage or child care expenses, and no indication regarding their assets. Although the AAO recognizes [REDACTED] and the couple's children will suffer some economic hardship, without more detailed information, the AAO is not in the position to conclude that the denial of the applicant's waiver application would cause extreme financial hardship. In any event, even assuming some economic difficulty, the mere showing of economic harm to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship. *See INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968) (holding that separation of family members and financial difficulties alone do not establish extreme hardship).

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's wife or children 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 he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, 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.