

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

PUBLIC COPY



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

[REDACTED]

H₂

Date: **OCT 05 2011** Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:
[REDACTED]

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 Director of the California Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The application will be denied.

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 director indicated that the applicant sought a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h). The director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that her bar to admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly.

On appeal, counsel asserted that sufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse, child, and parents. Counsel stated that the hardship that will be suffered by the applicant's family if he is deported to Cuba, where there is a communist regime, was not considered in the hardship determination. Counsel asserted that an interview was required in the instant case. Counsel declared that the applicant's crime occurred more than 14 years ago and was committed to defend her child, and these factors were not considered in the hardship determination.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO will first address the finding of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act.

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.

(i) Exception.-Clause (i)(I) shall not apply to an alien who committed only one crime if-

....

(I) 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 the recently decided *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." *Silva-Trevino*, 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. *Id.* 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 shows that on January 18, 1994, the applicant pled nolo contendere to aggravated battery without a deadly weapon. Adjudication of guilt was withheld and the applicant was placed on probation for one year, and ordered to complete an anger control program and have no contact with the victim.

Fla. Stat. § 784.045 provides:

(1)(a) A person commits aggravated battery who, in committing battery:

1. Intentionally or knowingly causes great bodily harm, permanent disability, or permanent disfigurement; or
2. Uses a deadly weapon.

(b) A person commits aggravated battery if the person who was the victim of the battery was pregnant at the time of the offense and the offender knew or should have known that the victim was pregnant.

(2) Whoever commits aggravated battery shall be guilty of a felony of the second degree, punishable as provided in s. 775.082, s. 775.083, or s. 775.084.

Aggravated battery is a second degree felony and is punishable by a term of imprisonment not exceeding 15 years. *See Florida Statutes § 775.082*

The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals has held that aggravated battery, which includes the use of a deadly weapon or results in serious bodily injury, is a crime involving moral turpitude. *See Sosa-Martinez v. U.S. Atty. Gen.*, 420 F.3d 1338, 1342 (11th Cir. 2005). Thus, we concur that the applicant's crime under Fla. Stat. § 784.045 involves moral turpitude, rendering her inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act.

Counsel argues that the applicant committed aggravated battery to defend her child. However, the Board held in *In Re Max Alejandro Madrigal-Calvo*, 21 I&N Dec. 323, 327 (BIA 1996), that collateral attacks on a conviction do not operate to negate the finality of the conviction unless and until the conviction is overturned. (citations omitted). A collateral attack on a judgment of conviction cannot be entertained "unless the judgment is void on its face," and "it is improper to go behind the judicial record to determine the guilt or innocence of an alien." *Id.*

The applicant was convicted of aggravated battery. 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 battery is a violent crime. In the instant case, we do not find that there are national security or foreign policy considerations that warrant a favorable exercise of discretion, as the applicant has not demonstrated that she would be considered a dissident in Cuba. The applicant may demonstrate extraordinary circumstances by demonstrating that denial of admission would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to a qualifying relative.

In *Matter of Monreal-Aguinaga*, 23 I& N Dec. 56, 62 (BIA 2001), the Board 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 Board 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 Board 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 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 an exclusive list. *Id.*

In *Monreal*, the Board 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 Board 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 Board 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 Board 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 Board 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 Board 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 Board 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.”).

Counsel stated that the applicant’s family ties which are her lawful permanent resident husband, U.S. citizen daughter, and her U.S. citizen parents, are in the United States and she would experience extreme hardship if separated from them. Counsel declared that the applicant lived in the United States for almost 20 years and her family members, particularly her teenage daughter, would experience extreme hardship if separated from the applicant. Furthermore, counsel stated that due to poor economic conditions in Cuba the applicant’s husband and daughter in the United States would experience economic loss in having to financially support the applicant. Counsel declared that the applicant would not be able to support herself because she will be labeled a “dissident” and because of the low monthly minimum wage. Moreover, counsel indicated that the applicant cannot return to Cuba because she will be persecuted on account of her “dissident” beliefs and political opinion, and that the applicant’s spouse, daughter, and parents will suffer extreme emotional hardship in not knowing whether the applicant will be harmed for her anti-Communist opinion. Counsel stated that the U.S. Department of State reported on human rights violations in Cuba.

Counsel stated that the applicant’s family members would experience emotional and financial hardship due to the applicant’s financial and emotional hardships in Cuba. The record contains the U.S. Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – 2007 for Cuba, which stated that Cuba is a totalitarian communist state and the report describes religious restrictions; arbitrary interference with privacy, family, home, or correspondence; freedom of speech and press; freedom of assembly and association; work conditions; and other subjects. U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – 2007: Cuba*, 1 (March 11, 2008). The monthly minimum wage, on average, was nine dollars, and the government admitted that it was not sufficient to provide a decent standard of living for a worker and family. *Id.* at 11. However, counsel does not specify why the applicant would be perceived and treated as a “dissident,” and for that reason harmed and mistreated. Counsel has not demonstrated that the applicant will not be able to obtain a job for which she is qualified that would provide a

sufficient wage in which to live decently, and counsel has not demonstrated that the applicant's husband would not be able to financially support his wife. The AAO recognizes the close relationship between the applicant and her husband and teenage daughter, and the applicant's father and mother, and that they will experience emotional hardship as a result of separation from her. When all of the hardship factors are considered together, we find they fail to establish that the hardship to the applicant's husband, daughter, and parents would be "exceptional and extremely unusual" if they remained in the United States without her.

There is no hardship claim to the applicant's husband, daughter, and parents if they join her to live in Cuba.

In conclusion, the applicant has not demonstrated that the hardship to a qualifying relative meets the "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" standard as articulated in 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d), and we do not find that there are other extraordinary circumstances that warrant a favorable exercise of discretion in this case. Thus, regardless of whether the evidence establishes extreme hardship and the applicant is statutorily eligible for relief, she has not demonstrated that she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(h) of the Act, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has not met that burden.

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