

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U. S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

htz

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: MAR 09 2011

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:

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 \$630. 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,

Mahul Shumway

for

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for waiver of inadmissibility was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Cuba who was found to be inadmissible 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 a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant is applying for a waiver under section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h) in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse and daughter.

The director determined that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Director*, dated August 20, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he is the head of the household, and he wants to keep his family together. *Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B)*, dated September 17, 2008.

In support of the waiver application, the record includes, but is not limited to, the applicant's conviction records, financial documentation, the applicant's marriage certificate, the applicant's child's birth certificate, and a letter from the applicant. The entire record was reviewed and considered 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 reflects that on June 26, 2006, the applicant was convicted in the Circuit Court for Hillsborough County, Florida, Criminal Division, of two counts of burning to defraud insurer in violation of Florida Statutes § 817.233, a felony of the third degree. A felony of the third degree is punishable by a term of imprisonment not exceeding five years. See Florida Statutes § 775.082. The applicant was sentenced to 54 months probation, payment of fines, and placement in the community control program for the first count. He was sentenced to 60 months probation for the second count (Case No. 06-CF-008754).

At the time of the applicant's conviction, Florida Statutes § 817.233 provided:

Any person who willfully and with intent to injure or defraud the insurer sets fire to or burns or attempts so to do or who causes to be burned or who aids, counsels or procures the burning of any building, structure or personal property, of whatsoever class or character, whether the property of himself or herself or of another, which shall at the time be insured by any person against loss or damage by fire, shall be guilty of a felony of the third degree, punishable as provided in s. 775.082, s. 775.083, or s. 775.084.

Fraud has, as a general rule, been held to involve moral turpitude. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Jordan v. De George* concluded that "Whatever else the phrase 'crime involving moral turpitude' may mean in peripheral cases, the decided cases make it plain that crimes in which fraud was an ingredient have always been regarded as involving moral turpitude. . . . Fraud is the touchstone by which this case should be judged. The phrase 'crime involving moral turpitude' has without exception been construed to embrace fraudulent conduct." 341 U.S. 223, 232 (1951). Furthermore, the BIA has found arson to categorically constitute a crime involving moral turpitude. In *Matter of*

S, the Board held, "it necessarily follows that arson or attempt to commit arson involves an act committed purposely with an evil intention and constitutes an offence involving moral turpitude." 3 I&N Dec. 617, 618 (BIA 1949). Accordingly, we find that the applicant's conviction under Florida Statutes § 817.233 is categorically a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant does not contest his inadmissibility on appeal.

Section 212(h) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

(h) Waiver of subsection (a)(2)(A)(i)(I), (II), (B), (D), and (E).—The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security, "Secretary"] may, in [her] 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 established to the satisfaction of the [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...

(2) the [Secretary], in [her] discretion, and pursuant to such terms, conditions and procedures as [she] may by regulations prescribe, has consented to the alien's applying or reapplying for a visa, for admission to the United States, or adjustment of status.

The applicant is seeking a section 212(h) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from a violation of section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act. A waiver under section 212(h) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse, parent or child of the applicant. Hardship the alien himself experiences upon removal is irrelevant to section 212(h) waiver proceedings; the only relevant hardship in the present case is hardship suffered by the applicant's United States citizen spouse and child.

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*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996). In most discretionary matters, the alien bears the burden of proving eligibility simply by showing equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. *See Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). However, the AAO cannot find, based on the facts of this particular case, that the applicant merits a favorable exercise of discretion solely on the balancing of favorable and adverse factors. The applicant's convictions indicate that he may be subject to the heightened discretion standard of 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d) provides:

The Attorney General [Secretary, Department of Homeland Security], in general, will not favorably exercise discretion under section 212(h)(2) of the Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(h)(2)) to consent to an application or reapplication for a visa, or admission to the United States, or adjustment of status, with respect to immigrant aliens who are inadmissible under section 212(a)(2) of the Act in cases involving violent or dangerous crimes, except in extraordinary circumstances, such as those involving national security or foreign policy considerations, or cases in which an alien clearly demonstrates that the denial of the application for adjustment of status or an immigrant visa or admission as an immigrant would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. Moreover, depending on the gravity of the alien's underlying criminal offense, a showing of extraordinary circumstances might still be insufficient to warrant a favorable exercise of discretion under section 212(h)(2) of the Act.

The AAO notes that the words "violent" and "dangerous" and the phrase "violent or dangerous crimes" are not further defined in the regulation, and the AAO is aware of no precedent decision or other authority containing a definition of these terms as used in 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d). A similar phrase, "crime of violence," is found in section 101(a)(43)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(43)(F). Under that section, a crime of violence is an aggravated felony if the term of imprisonment is at least one year. As defined by 18 U.S.C. § 16, a crime of violence is an offense that has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another, *or* any other offense that is a felony and that, by its nature, involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense. We note that the Attorney General declined to reference section 101(a)(43)(F) of the Act or 18 U.S.C. § 16, or the specific language thereof, in 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d). Thus, we find that the statutory terms "violent or dangerous crimes" and "crime of violence" are not synonymous and the determination that a crime is a violent or dangerous crime under 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d) is not dependant on it having been found to be a crime of violence under 18 U.S.C. § 16 or an aggravated felony under section 101(a)(43)(F) of the Act. *See* 67 Fed. Reg. 78675, 78677-78 (December 26, 2002).

Nevertheless, we will use the definition of a crime of violence found in 18 U.S.C. § 16 as guidance in determining whether a crime is a violent crime under 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d), considering also other common meanings of the terms "violent" and "dangerous". The term "dangerous" is not defined specifically by 18 U.S.C. § 16 or any other relevant statutory provision. Thus, in general, we interpret the terms "violent" and "dangerous" in accordance with their plain or common meanings, and consistent with any rulings found in published precedent decisions addressing discretionary denials under the standard described in 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d). Decisions to deny waiver applications on the basis of discretion under 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d) are made on a factual "case-by-case basis." 67 Fed. Reg. at 78677-78.

Upon review of BIA precedent decisions, we conclude that the applicant's conviction for burning to defraud insurer is a crime of violence. In *Matter of Palacios-Pinera*, the Board held that an alien's "act of arson in the first degree, by its very nature, requires a substantial risk of physical force

against another person or property,” and is therefore a “crime of violence” within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 16. In reaching this decision, the Board noted that:

[T]he intentional starting of a fire or causing an explosion ordinarily would lead to the substantial risk of damaging property of another. Not only is there a risk to items belonging to others that are on or in the property, i.e., such as items left in a store, there always exists the risk that the fire will spread beyond the original intended property. Secondly, since there is a risk that the fire or explosion will encroach upon another structure and that structure may be occupied, arson involves a substantial risk to another person. Moreover, there is a real risk that the people responding to the fire, i.e., public employees who respond to emergencies, will be injured while extinguishing the fire or investigating the fire scene.

22 I. & N. Dec. 434, 437 (BIA 1998).

Accordingly, we find that the applicant’s crime is a violent or dangerous crime and the applicant must show that “extraordinary circumstances” warrant approval of the waiver. 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d). Extraordinary circumstances may exist in cases involving national security or foreign policy considerations, or if the denial of the applicant’s admission would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. *Id.* Finding no evidence of foreign policy, national security, or other extraordinary equities, the AAO will consider whether the applicant has “clearly demonstrate[d] that the denial of . . . admission as an immigrant would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship” to a qualifying relative. *Id.*

The exceptional and extremely unusual hardship standard is more restrictive than the extreme hardship standard. *Cortes-Castillo v. INS*, 997 F.2d 1199, 1204 (7th Cir. 1993). Since the applicant is subject to 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d), merely showing extreme hardship to his qualifying relatives under section 212(h) of the Act is not sufficient. He must meet the higher standard of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. Therefore, the AAO will at the outset determine whether the applicant meets this standard.

In *Matter of Monreal-Aguinaga*, 23 I& N Dec. 56, 62 (BIA 2001), the BIA determined that exceptional and extremely unusual hardship in cancellation of removal cases under section 240A(b) of the Act is hardship that “must be ‘substantially’ beyond the ordinary hardship that would be expected when a close family member leaves this country.” However, the applicant need not show that hardship would be unconscionable. *Id.* at 61.

The BIA stated that in assessing exceptional and extremely unusual hardship, it would be useful to view the factors considered in determining extreme hardship. *Id.* at 63. 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 the lower standard of extreme hardship. 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. *Id.*

In *Monreal*, the BIA provided additional examples of the hardship factors it deemed relevant for establishing exceptional and extremely unusual hardship:

[T]he ages, health, and circumstances of qualifying lawful permanent resident and United States citizen relatives. For example, an applicant who has elderly parents in this country who are solely dependent upon him for support might well have a strong case. Another strong applicant might have a qualifying child with very serious health issues, or compelling special needs in school. A lower standard of living or adverse country conditions in the country of return are factors to consider only insofar as they may affect a qualifying relative, but generally will be insufficient in themselves to support a finding of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. As with extreme hardship, all hardship factors should be considered in the aggregate when assessing exceptional and extremely unusual hardship.

23 I&N Dec. at 63-4.

In the precedent decision issued the following year, *Matter of Andazola-Rivas*, the BIA noted that, “the relative level of hardship a person might suffer cannot be considered entirely in a vacuum. It must necessarily be assessed, at least in part, by comparing it to the hardship others might face.” 23 I&N Dec. 319, 323 (BIA 2002). The issue presented in *Andazola-Rivas* was whether the Immigration Judge correctly applied the exceptional and extremely unusual hardship standard in a cancellation of removal case when he concluded that such hardship to the respondent’s minor children was demonstrated by evidence that they “would suffer hardship of an emotional, academic and financial nature,” and would “face complete upheaval in their lives and hardship that could conceivably ruin their lives.” *Id.* at 321 (internal quotations omitted). The BIA viewed the evidence of hardship in the respondent’s case and determined that the hardship presented by the respondent did not rise to the level of exceptional and extremely unusual. The BIA noted:

While almost every case will present some particular hardship, the fact pattern presented here is, in fact, a common one, and the hardships the respondent has outlined are simply not substantially different from those that would normally be expected upon removal to a less developed country. Although the hardships presented here might have been adequate to meet the former “extreme hardship” standard for suspension of deportation, we find that they are not the types of hardship envisioned by Congress when it enacted the significantly higher “exceptional and extremely unusual hardship” standard.

23 I&N Dec. at 324.

However, the BIA in *Matter of Gonzalez Recinas*, a precedent decision issued the same year as *Andazola-Rivas*, clarified that “the hardship standard is not so restrictive that only a handful of applicants, such as those who have a qualifying relative with a serious medical condition, will qualify for relief.” 23 I&N Dec. 467, 470 (BIA 2002). The BIA found that the hardship factors presented by the respondent cumulatively amounted to exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to her qualifying relatives. The BIA noted that these factors included her heavy financial and familial burden, lack of support from her children’s father, her U.S. citizen children’s unfamiliarity with the Spanish language, lawful residence of her immediate family, and the concomitant lack of family in Mexico. 23 I&N Dec. at 472. The BIA stated, “We consider this case to be on the outer limit of the narrow spectrum of cases in which the exceptional and extremely unusual hardship standard will be met.” *Id.* at 470.

An analysis under *Monreal-Aguinaga* and *Andazola-Rivas* is appropriate. See *Gonzalez Recinas*, 23 I&N Dec. at 469 (“While any hardship case ultimately succeeds or fails on its own merits and on the particular facts presented, *Matter of Andazola* and *Matter of Monreal* are the starting points for any analysis of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship.”). The AAO notes that exceptional and extremely unusual 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.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he is sorry and ashamed of his past actions. He states that he now has a family to take care of and he is the head of the household. He states that he loves his family and wants to keep them together. He notes that he owns his home and has held a steady job for the past four years. He claims that he is not a violent or dangerous person. He states that his immigration status is causing him stress, his blood pressure is rising, and he is on medication. The applicant contends that his family does not need to pay for his mistakes. *Notice of Appeal (Form I-290B)*, dated September 17, 2008.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant and his qualifying family members will likely experience emotional hardship if they are separated as a result of his inadmissibility. In *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, referring to the separation of an alien from qualifying relatives, 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). The AAO finds that the applicant’s separation from his spouse and child constitutes emotional suffering for his qualifying family members, but the applicant has failed to demonstrate that this hardship, when combined with other hardship factors, rises to the level of exceptional and extremely unusual. While almost every case will present some hardship, the fact pattern here is not ‘substantially’ beyond ordinary hardship.

The AAO will consider any claims of medical hardship to the applicant insofar as it affects his qualifying relatives. However, the applicant has failed to provide medical records or any other medical documentation as evidence of his current condition. Nor has he explained, or provided

evidence to demonstrate, the quality of medical care he and his family would have in Cuba. The applicant has indicated that he owns a home, and that he is gainfully employed. However, he has not made a financial hardship claim, or submitted documentation of his household expenses to support such a claim. 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)). While the applicant's assertions are valuable and have been considered, they can only be given little weight without supporting evidence.

All elements of hardship to the applicant's qualifying relatives, should they remain in the United States, have been considered in aggregate. The AAO observes that the record does not contain a statement from the applicant's spouse providing a first-hand account of the hardship she would suffer upon separation from the applicant. While the AAO acknowledges the applicant's spouse and child will likely suffer some emotional hardship upon separation from the applicant, the record does not show that such hardship rises to the level of exceptional and extremely unusual.

As previously discussed, a determination of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship should also include a consideration of the impacts of relocation on the applicant's qualifying relatives. In the instant case, the applicant has not asserted, or submitted evidence to demonstrate, that his wife or child would suffer exceptional and extremely unusual hardship in Cuba if they relocated there to maintain family unity. Accordingly, the AAO cannot determine that the applicant has a qualifying family member who would suffer exceptional and extremely unusual hardship upon relocation to Cuba.

In conclusion, the applicant has not established that his spouse or child would suffer exceptional and extremely unusual hardship if the applicant is denied admission to the United States. 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 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.