

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

H2

[Redacted]

Date: **APR 25 2012** 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, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h)

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,

for Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application 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 director stated 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 his 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 conveys that the applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse and friends and family members attest to the extreme financial and emotional hardship that the applicant's lawful permanent resident wife and six-year-old U.S. citizen child will suffer if the applicant is barred admission to the United States. Counsel maintains that the applicant provides financial and psychological support to his wife and child, that he files taxes, owns a house and business with his wife, has immediate family members in the United States, and owns income producing property.

Counsel asserts that in *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996), the Board held that in determining whether relief is to be granted in the exercise of discretion the adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident are to be balanced with the social and humane considerations. Counsel maintains that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) did not consider the equities and social and humane factors in the applicant's case. Counsel also states that the applicant was convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude in 2002, that his crime did not relate to a controlled substance or a crime of violence, and that the applicant completed probation. Counsel states that the applicant is 46 years old and has been in the United States since December 2000, and that the applicant committed the crime due to concern about providing a good life for his child.

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.

The record reflects that on August 12, 2002, the applicant pled guilty to and was convicted of possession of a cloning intercept instrument (credit card capture) in violation of Fla. Stat. Ann. § 817.625(2)(A)(1). The judge ordered that the applicant serve 18 months in the Department of Corrections and suspended the order on the condition that the applicant successfully complete three years supervised probation.

The director found that the applicant was convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant has not disputed inadmissibility on appeal, and we will not disturb the finding of the director.

The waiver for inadmissibility under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act is under section 212(h) of the Act. That section provides, in pertinent part:

(h) The Attorney General [Secretary of Homeland Security] may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraph (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 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 section 212(h) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from violation of section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse, parent, son, or daughter of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant is not a consideration under the statute and will be considered only to the extent that it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. If extreme hardship to the qualifying relative is established, the Secretary then assesses whether an exercise of discretion is warranted. See *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (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 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. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996); *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 883 (BIA 1994); *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.*

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., Matter of 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). For example, though family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal, separation from family living in the United States can also be the most important single hardship factor in considering hardship in the aggregate. *See Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *but see Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247 (separation of spouse and children from applicant not extreme hardship due to conflicting evidence in the record and because applicant and spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years). Therefore, we consider the totality of the circumstances in determining whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

In rendering this decision, the AAO will consider all of the evidence in the record.

The applicant’s wife stated in the letter dated March 25, 2007 that she has a close relationship with the applicant and that he is a good father to their child, who was born on June 15, 2002. She conveyed that as a full-time student she depends on his economic support. The submitted income tax records and employment letters do not demonstrate that the applicant’s wife is financially dependent on the applicant. While we recognize that the applicant’s wife and child will experience hardship if they remain in the United States without the applicant, the applicant has not demonstrated that their hardship is more than the common result of inadmissibility or removal. Furthermore, the applicant has not made any claim of hardship to his wife and daughter if they join him to live in Cuba.

In conclusion, we find that the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship to a qualifying relative as required 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 rests with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act. Here, the



Page 5

applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed and the waiver application will be denied.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.