

identifying information related to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U. S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Immigration and Citizenship 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: NOV 22 2011 Office: LOS ANGELES, CA

FILE: [REDACTED]

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,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Los Angeles, California, 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 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 crimes 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 his two U.S. citizen children and lawful permanent resident spouse.

In a decision, dated April 22, 2008, the field office director found 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), the applicant asserts that he feels the field office director misapplied the law and abused his discretion by not fully addressing hardship to his spouse.

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 (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.)

In *Matter of Silva-Trevino*, 24 I&N Dec. 687 (A.G. 2008), the Attorney General articulated a new methodology for determining whether a conviction is a crime involving moral turpitude where the language of the criminal statute in question encompasses conduct involving moral turpitude and conduct that does not. First, in evaluating whether an offense is one that categorically involves moral turpitude, an adjudicator reviews 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. 183, 193 (2007)). 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. If the statute has not been so applied in any case (including the alien’s own case), the adjudicator can reasonably conclude that all convictions under the statute may categorically be treated as ones involving moral turpitude.” *Id.* at 697, 708 (citing *Duenas-Alvarez*, 549 U.S. at 193).

However, if a case exists in which the criminal statute in question was applied to conduct that does not involve moral turpitude, “the adjudicator cannot categorically treat all convictions under that statute as convictions for crimes that involve moral turpitude.” 24 I&N Dec. at 697 (citing *Duenas-Alvarez*, 549 U.S. at 185-88, 193). An adjudicator then engages in a second-stage inquiry in which the adjudicator reviews the “record of conviction” to determine if the conviction was based on conduct involving moral turpitude. *Id.* 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.

If review of the record of conviction is inconclusive, an adjudicator then considers any additional evidence deemed necessary or appropriate to resolve accurately the moral turpitude question. 24 I&N Dec. at 699-704, 708-709. However, this “does not mean that the parties would be free to present any and all evidence bearing on an alien’s conduct leading to the conviction. (citation omitted). The sole purpose of the inquiry is to ascertain the nature of the prior conviction; it is not an invitation to relitigate the conviction itself.” *Id.* at 703.

The record indicates that the applicant has a history of six arrests with convictions resulting in 1982 and 1984. On April 14, 1982, Miami Dade County, Florida, the applicant was arrested and charged with Burglary under Fl. Stat. § 810.020(3B), Grand Larceny under Fl. Stat. § 812.014(2B), and Aggravated Assault of a Police Officer under Fl. Stat. § 784.072(B). On July 19, 1982, adjudication was withheld for all charges and the applicant was sentenced to 96 days in prison.

On October 2, 1982, in Miami-Dade County, Florida, the applicant was arrested and charged with Burglary and Possession of Burglary Tools. This arrest resulted in the applicant being convicted of Burglary and Grand Larceny and sentenced to two years imprisonment. Finally, on January 17, 1984, in Miami-Dade County, the applicant was charged with one count of Burglary and two counts of Grand Larceny. He was then convicted of one count of Burglary and one count of Grand Larceny and sentenced to two years in prison.

The AAO notes that in his statement, dated March 26, 2007, the applicant recounts his criminal record as follows: On October 15, 1981, he was arrested in Florida for vehicle theft and loitering, but his understanding was that the case was dismissed; on April 14, 1982, he was arrested for larceny, burglary, and aggravated assault on a police officer, but he believes these charges were also dismissed; on October 2, 1982 he was arrested and then later convicted of burglary and larceny and was sentenced to two years in jail; on January 17, 1984, he was again convicted of burglary and larceny and sentenced to two years in jail; and on February 1, 1984, he was arrested for larceny, but the charges were dismissed.

Section 101(a)(48) of the Act provides:

- (A) The term "conviction" means, with respect to an alien, a formal judgment of guilt of the alien entered by a court or, if adjudication of guilt has been withheld, where—
- (i) a judge or jury has found the alien guilty or the alien has entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or has admitted sufficient facts to warrant a finding of guilt, and
 - (ii) the judge has ordered some form of punishment, penalty, or restraint on the alien's liberty to be imposed.

The AAO finds that the applicant's arrests in 1982 for larceny, burglary, and aggravated assault on a police officer did result in convictions for immigration purposes. Although, the applicant stated that he believed these charges to be dismissed, he does not submit any documentation to show that they were dismissed, that he was not found guilty, or that he did not plead guilty to the charges. In addition, the applicant was sentenced to a punishment of 96 days in prison for the crimes.

The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) has maintained that the determinative factor in assessing whether burglary involves moral turpitude is whether the crime intended to be committed at the time of entry or prior to the breaking out involves moral turpitude. *Matter of M-*, 2 I&N Dec. 721, 723 (BIA 1946). For example, the BIA has held that burglary with intent to commit theft is a crime involving moral turpitude. *See Matter of Frentescu*, 18 I&N Dec. 244 (BIA 1982). In addition, , in *Matter of Louissaint*, 24 I&N Dec. 754, 759 (BIA 2009), the Board held that "moral turpitude is inherent in the act of burglary of an occupied dwelling itself and the respondent's unlawful entry into the dwelling of another with the intent to commit *any crime* therein is a crime involving moral turpitude." Current Florida statutes state at section § 810.02(1)(a) that for offenses committed on or before July 1, 2001, "burglary" means entering or remaining in a dwelling, a structure, or a conveyance with the intent to commit an offense therein, unless the premises are at the time open to

the public or the defendant is licensed or invited to enter or remain. The applicant has not submitted the record of conviction or other relevant documents to clarify the nature of his burglary offenses.

In regards to the applicant's larceny convictions, the record is also not complete. 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."). The applicant has not submitted the record of conviction or other relevant documents to clarify the nature of his theft offenses.

In regards to the applicant's conviction for aggravated assault on a police officer, assault on a law enforcement officer has been found to be a crime involving moral turpitude where the perpetrator knows the victim to be a law enforcement officer performing his official duty and the assault results in bodily injury to the officer. *See Matter of Danesh*, 19 I&N Dec. 669 (BIA 1988) (distinguishing cases in which knowledge of the police officer's status was not an element of the crime and where bodily injury or other aggravating factors were not present to elevate offense beyond "simple" assault); see also *Matter of O-*, 4 I&N Dec. 301 (BIA 1951) (German law involving an assault on a police officer was not a crime involving moral turpitude because knowledge that the person assaulted was a police officer engage in the performance of his duties was not an element of the crime); *Matter of B-*, 5 I&N Dec. 538 (BIA 1953) (as modified by *Matter of Danesh*, supra) (assault on prison guard not a crime involving moral turpitude because offense charged appeared to be only "simple" assault and no bodily injury was alleged); *Ciambelli ex rel. Maranci v. Johnson*, 12 F.2d 465 (D. Mass 1926) (assault on an officer was not a crime involving moral turpitude in spite of fact that defendant was armed with a razor because the razor was not used in the assault). The applicant has not submitted the record of conviction or other relevant documents to clarify the details of his conviction for aggravated assault of a police officer.

The applicant has not contested his inadmissibility. He has not submitted any documentation to show that his convictions were not crimes involving moral turpitude. 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. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Thus, for purposes of this appeal, the AAO will accept that the applicant's convictions for burglary, larceny, and aggravated assault on a police officer are crimes involving moral turpitude.

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

The Attorney General [Secretary of Homeland Security] may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraph (A)(i)(I) . . . of subsection (a)(2) . . . if -

(1) (A) in the case of any immigrant it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that --

(i) . . . the activities for which the alien is inadmissible occurred more than 15 years before the date of the alien's application for a visa, admission, or adjustment of status,

(ii) the admission to the United States of such alien would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security of the United States, and

(iii) the alien has been rehabilitated; or

(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 . . .; and

(2) the Attorney General [Secretary], in his discretion, and pursuant to such terms, conditions and procedures as he 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.

Section 212(h)(1)(A) of the Act provides that the Secretary may, in her discretion, waive the application of subparagraph (A)(i)(I) of subsection (a)(2) if the activities for which the applicant is inadmissible occurred more than 15 years before the date of the applicant's application for a visa, admission, or adjustment of status. An application for admission to the United States is a continuing application, and admissibility is determined on the basis of the facts and the law at the time the application is finally considered. *Matter of Alarcon*, 20 I&N Dec. 557, 562 (BIA 1992).

Since the criminal convictions for which the applicant was found inadmissible occurred more than 15 years ago, the inadmissibility can be waived under section 212(h)(1)(A) of the Act. Section 212(h)(1)(A) of the Act requires that the applicant's admission to the United States not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security of the United States, and that he has been rehabilitated.

However, even if the applicant were able to satisfy the requirements of section 212(h)(1)(A) of the Act, his waiver application would not be granted as the AAO finds that he is not deserving of a favorable exercise of the Secretary's discretion as he has been convicted of a violent or dangerous crime and is subject to 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d). For waivers of inadmissibility, the burden is on the applicant to establish that a grant of a waiver of inadmissibility is warranted in the exercise of discretion. *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 299 (BIA 1996). The adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident must be balanced with the social and humane considerations presented on his behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of this country. *Id.* at 300.

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.

The AAO finds that aggravated assault on a police officer is a violent crime. Accordingly, 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.*

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 AAO notes that the exceptional and extremely unusual hardship standard in cancellation of removal cases is identical to the standard put forth by the Attorney General in *Matter of Jean*, *supra*, and codified at 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d).

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.

The record of hardship includes: a statement from the applicant’s wife, a statement from the applicant’s stepson, a statement from the applicant’s stepdaughter, a statement from the applicant, medical records for the applicant’s wife, and the 2006 U.S. State Department Country Report on Human Rights Practices for Cuba.

In her statement, dated February 26, 2007, the applicant’s wife states that she is from Guatemala, that she has been married to the applicant since 1996 and that she has two U.S. citizen children. She also states that she has five older children in Guatemala and that the applicant has been like a father to her U.S. citizen children and always helps to support her other children in Guatemala. The applicant’s spouse states further that she has been a diabetic for ten years, must take insulin for her condition and see the doctor every two months. She states that she does not drive, so the applicant takes her to the hospital and the doctor. The applicant’s spouse states that she once had to visit the emergency room because her sugar is out of control and that she recently suffered a seizure as a result of the stress being caused by the possibility of the applicant having to leave the United States. In addition to fearing the departure of the applicant from the United States, the applicant’s spouse states that she would fear relocating to Cuba. She states that her husband left Cuba because he did not want to fight for the Communist and that she feels her children would be in great danger if they relocated to Cuba. She states that relocating to Guatemala is also not possible because it is poor and dangerous and she would not be able to access good medical care in Guatemala. Finally, the applicant’s spouse states that the applicant is the family’s sole financial support because she cannot work due to her medical condition.

In his statement, the applicant's stepson states that if the applicant is returned to Cuba his mother and sister will likely go with him and that he will then also follow the family to Cuba. He states that he fears for his safety in both Cuba and Guatemala and that two of his older brothers were killed in Guatemala for refusing to join the [REDACTED]. The applicant's stepdaughter's statement reiterated the fears of her mother and brother.

In his statement, dated March 26, 2007, the applicant states that his wife is insisting that she will relocate with him if he is returned to Cuba and that his family relocating with him is frightening as his wife has a medical condition and all of his family members' safety would be at risk.

Medical records for the applicant's spouse show that she had a seizure with a tension headache on February 7, 2007 and went to the emergency room as a result. The records also indicate that the applicant is prescribed insulin, presumably for her diabetes, and Prozac.

The 2006 U.S. State Department Country Report on Human Rights Practices in Cuba states that the Cuban government had a poor human rights record and denied their citizens the right to change their government, among many other human rights abuses.

The AAO finds that the applicant's spouse has not shown that she would suffer exceptional and extremely unusual hardship as a result of separation, nor has she shown that she would suffer exceptional and extremely unusual hardship as a result of relocating to Cuba or to Guatemala. The record indicates that the applicant's spouse is dependant on the applicant financially and for some daily functions, such as driving, because of her diabetes. The record does not show that in the absence of the applicant, she has no other family members to help her. The AAO acknowledges that being separated from the applicant would cause severe hardship to his spouse, but that the current record does not show that this hardship rises to the level of exceptional and extremely unusual. Similarly, the record does not indicate that relocating to Cuba would cause exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. The record does not support a finding that the applicant's spouse would be unable to receive quality medical care in Cuba or that the family's safety would be at risk in Cuba. In regards to relocating to Guatemala, the record does not contain any documentation supporting the safety and financial concerns moving to Guatemala would cause for the applicant's family. 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)). Therefore, the record does not show that the difficulties faced by the applicant's qualifying relatives, considered in the aggregate, would rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. *Matter of Monreal-Aguinaga*, 23 I&N Dec. at 62. Accordingly, the applicant has not demonstrated that he merits a favorable exercise 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. 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.