

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: NEWARK, NJ Date: **MAY 24 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:



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,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Newark, New Jersey, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Nigeria 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), in order to remain in the United States with her U.S. citizen spouse.

In a decision dated October 23, 2007, the field office director found the applicant inadmissible for having been convicted of Sale of Simulated Document under New Jersey Code § 2C:21-2.1. The field office 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 a Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B) dated November 21, 2007, counsel states that the field office director was incorrect in finding that the applicant's spouse would not suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's removal, that the decision was an abuse of discretion, and that the applicant's conviction was under a New Jersey statute and was not a federal crime.

In support of the waiver application, counsel has submitted a brief and a statement from the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse. The entire record has been reviewed in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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.)

The record shows that the applicant was arrested in Burlington County, New Jersey on March 22, 2004 and charged with two counts of sale of simulated document in the third degree and two counts of sale of simulated document in the fourth degree. The applicant, who was born on September 27, 1975, was 29 years old at the time she committed the acts that resulted in her arrest.

The record shows that the applicant was convicted in New Jersey Superior Court on April 16, 2007 of one count of sale of simulated document in the third degree under New Jersey Code § 2C:21-2.1C, which is punishable by a maximum of five years imprisonment. All other charges were dismissed and the applicant was placed on probation for one year.

At the time of the applicant's conviction, New Jersey Code § 2C:21-2.1C provided, in pertinent parts:

A person who knowingly exhibits, displays or utters a document or other writing which falsely purports to be a driver's license, birth certificate or other document issued by a governmental agency and which could be used as a means of verifying a person's identity or age or any other personal identifying information is guilty of a crime of the third degree...

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). Although intent to defraud is not an element of the statute under which the applicant was convicted, the crime required, at a minimum, the knowing use of a false identification document purportedly issued by a government agency. We note that in *Matter of Flores*, 17 I&N Dec. 225, 230 (BIA 1980), the BIA held that uttering and selling false or counterfeit paper related to the registry of aliens was a crime involving moral turpitude, even though intent to defraud was not an explicit statutory element. We find that a conviction under section 2C:21-2.1C of the New Jersey Code "is accompanied by a vicious motive or corrupt mind" and is thus categorically a crime involving moral turpitude. *See, e.g., Omagah v.*

Ashcroft, 288 F.3d 254, 262 (5th Cir. 2002) (finding that crimes that do not involve fraud, but that include “dishonesty or lying as an essential element” also tend to involve moral turpitude); *see also Itani v. Ashcroft*, 298 F.3d 1213, 1216 (11th Cir. 2002) (“Generally a crime involving dishonesty or false statement is considered to be one involving moral turpitude.”). We also note that the fact that the applicant’s conviction was obtained under a New Jersey statute instead of a federal statute is of no consequence to the finding of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act. Regardless of where the applicant was convicted, the question of inadmissibility turns on whether the conviction was for a crime that involved moral turpitude. Thus, we find that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) as a consequence of her conviction for sale of a simulated document.

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 spouse. Hardship to the applicant is not considered under the statute unless 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 he or she accompanies the applicant or in the event that he or 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.

In a statement dated September 5, 2007, the applicant’s spouse states that if the applicant is found inadmissible he will be devastated and his life will again have no meaning. He states that his life has changed tremendously since meeting the applicant, that he has reconciled with his family and that his hope has been restored.

In his brief counsel states that the applicant’s spouse cannot relocate to Nigeria because he is unfamiliar with the culture, does not speak the language, and all of his family is in the United States. The AAO notes that the official language of Nigeria, a former British colony, is English. Counsel also states that the applicant’s spouse cares for his mother who recently had a kidney transplant. Counsel states further that the applicant’s spouse would face extreme hardship as a result of separation because he would lose his life partner and live alone.

Counsel also states that the applicant would suffer extreme hardship upon her return to Nigeria. The AAO notes, as stated above, that hardship to the applicant is not considered in section 212(h) waiver proceedings unless it is found that hardship to the applicant will cause hardship to the applicant’s qualifying relative.

The AAO finds that the record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant’s spouse faces extreme hardship if the applicant is not granted a waiver of inadmissibility.

The record does not provide any supporting documentation for the hardship claims made by the applicant’s spouse and counsel. 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)). Similarly, without documentary evidence to support a claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy an applicant'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 acknowledges that the applicant's spouse will experience emotional hardship if he remains in the United States without his spouse, but the applicant has failed to demonstrate that this hardship, when combined with other hardship factors, will be extreme. The AAO recognizes the significance of family separation as a hardship factor, but concludes that the hardship described by the applicant is the common result of removal or inadmissibility and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of removal or inadmissibility are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). 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.

The AAO also acknowledges that relocating to a foreign country like Nigeria would be difficult, but the record does not show through supporting documentation that it would be an extreme hardship to relocate.

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that the hardships faced by the applicant's spouse 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 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 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. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.