

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

H₂

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA Date: JUL 26 2010

IN RE: Applicant: [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:

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Shumway".

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office 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 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). The director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative, her U.S. citizen husband, and denied the waiver application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that she has a close relationship with her husband and that it would be very difficult for him to live in the Bahamas. She declares that if her husband remained in the United States without her it would end their relationship.

The AAO will first address the finding of inadmissibility. 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.

The Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) 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 record shows that the applicant pled guilty to and was convicted of grand theft in the third degree in Florida on April 9, 2009. Adjudication was withheld and the applicant was sentenced to 12 months probation. Grand theft of the third degree is a third degree felony punishable by a maximum of five years imprisonment. Fl. Stat. § 775.082(3)(d).

At the time of the applicant's conviction, Fl. Stat. § 812.014(2)(c)(1) provided, in pertinent parts:

(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.

(2) . . .

(c) It is grand theft of the third degree and a felony of the third degree, punishable as provided in s. 775.082, s. 775.083, or s. 775.084, if the property stolen is:

(1) Valued at \$300 or more, but less than \$5,000. . . .

In *Matter of Silva-Trevino* the Attorney General adopted the “realistic probability” standard articulated by the Supreme Court in *Gonzalez v. Duenas-Alvarez*, 549 U.S. 183 (2007), as an approach for determining inadmissibility under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act. See 24 I&N Dec. 687, 698 (2008).

The methodology articulated by the Attorney General for determining whether a conviction is a crime involving moral turpitude requires an adjudicator to review 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. at 193). 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. . . .” *Id.* at 697, 708 (citing *Duenas-Alvarez*, 549 U.S. at 193).

Several U.S. Courts have distinguished the realistic probability test articulated in *Duneas-Alvarez* in cases where “a state statute explicitly defines a crime more broadly than the generic definition” and “no ‘legal imagination,’ is required to hold that a realistic probability exists that the state will apply its statute to conduct that falls outside the generic definition of the crime.” *United States v. Grisel*, 488 F.3d 844, 850 (9th Cir. 2007)(citing *Duenas-Alvarez*, 127 S.Ct. at 822). In *United States v. Vidal*, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals determined that a “realistic probability” that the theft statute under which the alien was convicted would be applied to conduct that falls outside the generic definition of theft could be found in the plain text of the statute. 504 F.3d 1072, 1082 (9th Cir. 2007). The Ninth Circuit noted that “when ‘[t]he state statute’s greater breadth is evident from its text,’ a defendant may rely on the statutory language to establish the statute as overly inclusive.” *Id.* (citing to *United States v. Grisel*, 488 F.3d at 850.).

In the instant case, the statute under which the applicant was convicted, Fl. Stat. § 812.014, involves both temporary and permanent takings. 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 Board 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.

Because the full range of conduct proscribed by the statute at hand does not constitute a crime involving moral turpitude, we will apply the modified categorical approach and engage in a second-stage inquiry by reviewing the record of conviction to determine if the conviction was based on conduct involving moral turpitude. *Silva-Trevino* 24 I&N Dec. 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. The record of conviction in this case includes the court disposition and the arrest report. The arrest report states that the applicant selected merchandise valued at \$787.00 at JC Penny, and that the co-defendant who was assigned to the register, knowingly and intentionally placed the merchandise in JC Penny bags without charging the applicant, and that the applicant exited the store without paying for the merchandise.

In *In re Jurado-Delgado*, 24 I&N Dec. 29, 33-34 (BIA 2006), the Board found that 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 present case. Based on the evidence in the record, the AAO finds that the applicant's crime was retail theft. 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

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 U.S. citizen husband. Hardship to the applicant herself 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.

“Extreme hardship” is not a definable term of “fixed and inflexible meaning”; establishing extreme hardship is “dependent upon the facts and circumstances of each case.” *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). The Board in *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* lists the factors it considers relevant in determining whether an applicant has established extreme hardship a qualifying relative pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. 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.* at 565-566.

In *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996), the Board stated that the factors to consider in determining whether extreme hardship exists “provide a framework for analysis,” and that the “[r]elevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists.” It further stated that “the trier of fact must consider the entire range of factors concerning hardship in their totality” and then “determine whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation.” (citing *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 882 (BIA 1994).

In rendering this decision, the AAO will consider all of the evidence in the record.

Extreme hardship to the applicant’s spouse must be established in the event that he joins the applicant to live in the Bahamas, and alternatively, if he remains in the United States without her. A qualifying relative is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant’s waiver request.

With regard to the applicant’s spouse joining the applicant to live in the Bahamas, the applicant’s spouse declares in a letter submitted on appeal that it will be very difficult for her husband to live in the Bahamas. The applicant, however, has not specified or provided evidence of the hardship that her husband would endure if he joined her to live in the Bahamas. The burden of proof in this proceeding lies with the applicant, and “while an analysis of a given application includes a review of all claims put forth in light of the facts and circumstances of a case, such analysis does not extend to discovery of undisclosed negative impacts.” *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247. The AAO is unable to conclude that the applicant’s husband will suffer extreme hardship if he relocated to the Bahamas with his wife.

The applicant contends that she has a close relationship with her husband, but separation would end their relationship. The record conveys that the applicant has been married to her husband since February 8, 2007. Family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal in some cases. See *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. at 813. Nevertheless, family ties are to be considered in analyzing hardship. See *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 565-66. The question of whether family separation is the ordinary result of inadmissibility or removal may depend on the type of familial relationship considered. For example, in *Matter of Shaughnessy*, the Board considered the scenario of parents being separated from their soon-to-be adult son, finding that this separation would not result in extreme hardship to the parents. *Id.* at 811-12; see also *U.S. v. Arrieta*, 224 F.3d 1076, 1082 (9th Cir. 2000) (“[redacted] was not a spouse, but a son and

brother. It was evident from the record that the effect of the deportation order would be separation rather than relocation.”). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board considered the scenario of the respondent’s spouse accompanying him to Mexico, finding that she would not experience extreme hardship from losing “physical proximity to her family” in the United States. 22 I&N Dec. at 566-67.

The decision in *Cervantes-Gonzalez* reflects the norm that spouses reside with one another and otherwise establish a life together, such that separating from one another is likely to result in substantial hardship. It is common for both spouses to relocate abroad if one of them is not allowed to stay in the United States, which typically results in separation from other family members living in the United States. Other decisions reflect the expectation that minor children will remain with their parents, upon whom they usually depend for financial and emotional support. See, e.g., *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 886 (“[I]t is generally preferable for children to be brought up by their parents.”). Therefore, the most important single hardship factor may be separation, particularly where spouses and minor children are concerned. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *Cerrillo-Perez*, 809 F.2d at 1422.

Regardless of the type of familial relationship involved, the hardship resulting from family separation is based on the actual impact of separation on an applicant, and all hardships must be considered in determining whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond the consequences ordinarily associated with removal or inadmissibility. *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. at 383. Indeed, the specific facts of a case may dictate that even the separation of a spouse and children from an applicant does not constitute extreme hardship. In *Matter of Ngai*, for instance, the Board did not find extreme hardship because the claims of hardship conflicted with evidence in the record and because the applicant and his spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years. 19 I&N Dec. at 247. Nevertheless, though we require an applicant to show that a qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship both in the event of relocation and in the event of separation, in analyzing the latter scenario, we give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship of separation itself, particularly in cases involving the separation of spouses from one another and/or minor children from a parent. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293.

Even if the AAO were to find that the applicant’s husband would experience extreme hardship if he remained in the United States without his wife, the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship to her husband if he joined her to live in the Bahamas. Thus, the record before the AAO fails to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying family member for purposes of relief under section 212(h) of the Act.

Because the applicant is statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose is served in discussing whether she 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. The applicant has not met that burden.

Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.