

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 30 2012**


Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

IN RE: 

PETITION: 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 PETITIONER:



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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file any motion directly with the AAO. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to 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. The applicant then filed a motion to reconsider, which was granted and the waiver application was again denied by the Director. The waiver application 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 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 crimes involving moral turpitude. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. citizen and has three U.S. citizen children. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), so that he may reside in the United States with his family.

In a decision, dated December 21, 2009, the director found that due to numerous recent arrests, including one for domestic battery, the applicant has failed to show that he had been rehabilitated in accordance with section 212(h)(1)(A) of the Act. The director also found that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative as a result of his inadmissibility and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant's wife and three children would suffer extreme hardship which qualifies him for a waiver under 212(h)(1)(B) of the Act.

Section 212(a)(2) of the Act states, in pertinent parts:

(A)(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).

(B) Multiple criminal convictions.-Any alien convicted of 2 or more offenses (other than purely political offenses), regardless of whether the conviction was in a single trial or whether the offenses arose from a single scheme of misconduct and regardless of whether the offenses involved moral turpitude, for which the aggregate sentences to confinement were 5 years or more is inadmissible.

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 applicant's case arises within the jurisdiction of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, which has recently reaffirmed the traditional categorical approach for determining whether a crime involves moral turpitude. *See Fajardo v. Attorney General*, 659 F.3d 1303, 1310 (11th Cir. 2011) (finding that the Congress intended the traditional categorical or modified categorical approach to be used to determine whether convictions were convictions for crimes involving moral turpitude and declining to follow the "realistic probability approach" put forth by the Attorney General in *Matter of Silva-Trevino*, 24 I&N Dec. 687 (A.G. 2008)). In its decision, the Eleventh Circuit defined the categorical approach as "looking only to the statutory definitions of the prior offenses, and not to the particular facts underlying those convictions." 659 F.3d at 1305 (quoting *Taylor v. United States*, 495 U.S. 575, 600 (1990)). The court indicated, however, that where the statutory definition of a crime includes "conduct that would categorically be grounds for removal as well as conduct that would not, then the record of conviction – i.e., the charging document, plea, verdict, and sentence – may also be considered." 659 F.3d at 1305 (citing *Jaggernaut v. U.S. Att'y Gen.*, 432 F.3d 1346, 1354-55 (11th Cir. 2005)).

The record indicates that on October 8, 1986, the applicant was charged with burglary of conveyance under 810.02 of the Florida Statutes. On June 1, 1987, the applicant was convicted of the charge, placed on probation, and made to pay restitution and fines.

November 18, 1986, the applicant was charged with burglary of conveyance under 810.02 of the

Florida Statutes, possession of burglary tools under 810.06 of the Florida Statutes, and carrying a concealed weapon under 790.01 Florida Statutes. On February 9, 1989 the applicant was convicted of burglary of conveyance under 810.02 of the Florida Statutes and was sentenced to two years probation.

On September 23, 1993, the applicant was charged with battery after being arrested for a domestic dispute, but this charge was dismissed.

More recently, the record indicates that on September 1, 2009, the applicant was arrested again for domestic battery, but the record does not indicate how this arrest was resolved.

U.S. Courts have held that the crime of theft or larceny, whether grand or petty, involves moral turpitude. See *Matter of Scarpulla*, 15 I&N Dec. 139, 140 (BIA 1974)(stating, "It is well settled that theft or larceny, whether grand or petty, has always been held to involve moral turpitude . . ."); *Morasch v. INS*, 363 F.2d 30, 31 (9th Cir. 1966)(stating, "Obviously, either petty or grand larceny, i.e., stealing another's property, qualifies [as a crime involving moral turpitude].") However, the BIA has indicated that 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).

The AAO notes that as the applicant does not contest his inadmissibility on appeal, the AAO will not disturb the finding of the Director.

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.

The record includes a statement from the applicant, a warranty deed for a piece of land jointly owned by the applicant, a letter from the applicant's spouse, and a letter of recommendation from the applicant's employer.

In a statement, dated seven months before the applicant's September 2009 arrest, the applicant states that he has not been convicted of any crimes since he turned his life around, that he is married, and has three children. The record also indicates that the applicant has been in the floor installation business for 20 years, pays his taxes, and is very supportive of his wife and three children. The record does not address the applicant's September 2009 arrest for domestic battery. The record fails to indicate any details of the incident or how the arrest was resolved. Without information regarding this arrest the AAO cannot make a finding that the applicant has been rehabilitated. Thus, based on the current record, the AAO must find that the applicant has failed to establish that he qualifies for a waiver under section 212(h)(1)(A) of the Act.

The record also fails to establish that the applicant qualifies for a waiver under section 212(h)(1)(B) of the Act. A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(h)(1)(B) 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 three children are the 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).

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.

The applicant's spouse is claiming extreme emotional and financial hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility. The applicant's spouse states that she suffers from bipolar disorder, which has been left untreated because she does not have health insurance, and that she is not employed. She states that the applicant is the sole income earner for the family. The applicant states that his family could not relocate to Cuba to be with him because they are not Cuban citizens and that travel restrictions would make it hard for his family to visit him.

We find that the applicant has failed to submit evidence to support these claims. The record does not include any documentation regarding the applicant's spouse's history of mental illness and how the applicant's support is necessary. The record also fails to include any evidence to support the claims made about relocation to Cuba. 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)). Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse and/or children caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. 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.