

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



H2


DATE: MAY 11 2011 Office: BALTIMORE, MD

FILE:

IN RE: Applicant:

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 \$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,

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Baltimore, Maryland. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

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's spouse and younger daughter are U.S. citizens and her older daughter is a lawful permanent resident. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h).

The field office director concluded that the applicant had 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 District Director*, dated December 2, 2008.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the district director misapplied the pertinent case law and that a qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship. *Form I-290B*, received January 2, 2009.

The record includes, but is not limited to, the applicant's spouse's statements, the applicant's statement, medical records for the applicant and her younger daughter, and country conditions information on Jamaica. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

The record reflects that the applicant was convicted on November 20, 2003 of theft (less than \$500 value) under Maryland Statutes § 7-104. She received a suspended sentence of 11 months and 29 days, a \$500 fine, \$20 in costs and \$35 for CICF.

A conviction for theft is considered to involve moral turpitude only when a permanent taking is intended. *Matter of Grazley*, 14 I&N Dec. 330 (BIA 1973). Upon review of Maryland court decisions, the AAO finds that a conviction for theft under the Maryland Criminal Code requires the specific intent to deprive the victim of his or her property permanently. In *Price v. State*, the Maryland Court of Special Appeals discussed the distinctions between a conviction for theft and a conviction for carjacking. 681 A.2d 1206 (1996). The Court stated that a theft conviction "requires proof of circumstances that would indicate the offender's intent permanently to deprive the owner of his or her property whether by way of appropriating it to one's own use or concealment or abandonment in such a manner as to deprive the owner of the property" while carjacking "does not require that there be any asportation or removal of the vehicle for criminal responsibility to attach." 681 A.2d at 1214. As such, the AAO finds that the applicant committed a crime involving moral turpitude and the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act.

Section 212(a)(2)(A) of the Act states in pertinent part, that:

- (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 [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 spouse and children are the only qualifying relatives 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).

As a qualifying relative is not required to depart the United States as a consequence of an applicant's inadmissibility, two distinct factual scenarios exist should a waiver application be denied: either the qualifying relative will join the applicant to reside abroad or the qualifying relative will remain in the United States. Ascertaining the actual course of action that will be taken is complicated by the fact that an applicant may easily assert a plan for the qualifying relative to relocate abroad or to remain in the United States depending on which scenario presents the greatest prospective hardship, even though no intention exists to carry out the alleged plan in reality. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 885 (BIA 1994) (addressing separation of minor child from both parents applying for suspension of deportation). Thus, we interpret the statutory language of the various waiver provisions in section 212 of the Act to require an applicant to establish extreme hardship to his or her qualifying relative(s) under both possible scenarios. To endure the hardship of separation when extreme hardship could be avoided by joining the applicant abroad, or to endure the hardship of relocation when extreme hardship could be avoided by remaining in the United States, is a matter of choice and not the result of removal or inadmissibility. As the Board of Immigration Appeals stated in *Matter of Ige*:

[W]e consider the critical issue . . . to be whether a child would suffer extreme hardship if he accompanied his parent abroad. If, as in this case, no hardship would ensue, then the fact

that the child might face hardship if left in the United States would be the result of parental choice, not the parent's deportation.

Id. See also *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (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 deportation, 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. at 631-32; *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 883; *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.*

We observe that 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., *In re 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).

Family separation, for instance, 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 nature of family 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) (“Mr. [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 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 family relationship involved, the hardship resulting from family separation is determined based on the actual impact of separation on a qualifying relative, 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. 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.

The first part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the event of relocation to Jamaica. Counsel refers to supporting documentation in stating that the economy, health conditions and educational system in Jamaica are poor; Jamaica is ranked 101 for life expectancy, literacy, education and GDP; high employment exacerbates criminal problems and violent crime is a serious problem in Jamaica; medical care is more limited than in the United States and cash payment is often required up front; there have been numerous incidents of dengue fever since 2007; and there is a high prevalence of hypertension and diabetes. *I-601 Rebuttal Letter*, dated October 21, 2008. The record includes country conditions information which support counsel’s claims of general country conditions.

The applicant's spouse states that the economy in Jamaica is very poor; he could barely earn a living to support himself there; he could not earn close to his current income in Jamaica; and the medical facilities are not as advanced in regard to diabetes and asthma treatment. *Applicant's Spouse's Second Statement*, undated. Counsel states that the applicant's spouse would not be able to provide essential medical care for his family. *I-601 Rebuttal Letter*. The record reflects that the applicant has uncontrolled diabetes mellitus and hypertension, and she is demonstrating early signs of macrovascular and microvascular complications. *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated October 13, 2008. The record reflects that the applicant's younger daughter has asthma; she should receive immediate treatment when she gets an attack; she was given a nebulizer machine for immediate treatment; she should receive continuous, prescribed medication for asthma; and she was admitted to the hospital for asthma and a bacterial blood infection. *Letter from* [REDACTED], dated October 21, 2008. The record reflects that the applicant's younger daughter was recently hospitalized twice for reactive airway disease; her last episode had concurrent bacteraemia; she feels well between episodes; and she was prescribed Pulmicort and instructed to take one nebulizer dose twice a day. *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated January 10, 2008. However, the record does not include supporting documentary evidence that the applicant's younger daughter could not receive treatment for asthma in Jamaica or that the applicant could not receive treatment for her medical issues. In addition, the record does not establish that the applicant or her spouse could not obtain employment in Jamaica. The record is not clear as to whether the applicant's family would reside in a dangerous area in Jamaica. Going on record without supporting documentation will not meet the applicant's burden of proof in this proceeding. *See 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)). The record does not include any other claims or documentary evidence of hardship. There are no claims of hardship made in regard to the applicant's older daughter. The record does not include sufficient evidence of financial, medical, emotional or other types of hardship, which in their totality, establish that a qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship upon residing in Jamaica.

The second part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship in the event that a qualifying relative resides in the United States. Counsel states that the applicant's spouse depends on the applicant to care for their children; and aside from the heart break of separation, child care and additional health care would be financial stressors. *I-601 Rebuttal Letter*. The applicant states that her younger daughter is suffering from severe asthma; she is required to use nebulizer breathing machine twice a day to take Pulmicort; she gives her younger daughter asthma medicine when her spouse is working; the medicine is critical for her; she has been hospitalized twice for her asthma; and her spouse and children are emotionally and financially dependent on her. *Applicant's Statement*, undated. The record does not include documentary evidence of financial hardship. The record reflects that the applicant's younger daughter and spouse would experience difficulty without her. However, the record does not include sufficient evidence of financial, medical, emotional or other types of hardship, which in their totality, establish that a qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship upon remaining in the United States.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in an additional discussion of 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 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.