






U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)




DATE: **JUL 09 2013** OFFICE: LOS ANGELES

FILE: 

IN RE: 

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 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 in accordance with the instructions on 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,

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Los Angeles, California. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), and the matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and reconsider. The motion will be granted, but the application will remain denied.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico 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 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 lawful permanent resident spouse and U.S. citizen children.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the Form I-601 application for a waiver accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated July 23, 2009. On appeal, the AAO determined that the applicant had failed to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in the field office director's decision and summarily dismissed the appeal. *See Decision of the AAO*, dated February 29, 2012.

The applicant has submitted a motion to reopen or reconsider the dismissal of his appeal. The AAO will grant the applicant's motion to reopen. On the applicant's motion, counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant has satisfied his burden of demonstrating extreme hardship to his qualifying relatives upon separation by demonstrating the financial and emotional hardship that will be suffered by his spouse and children. Counsel further asserts that the applicant's spouse and children cannot relocate to Mexico because of the negative conditions in that country, including safety, educational, and financial hardships.

In support of the applicant's motion to reopen and reconsider, the applicant submitted identity documents, letters from his spouse and children, a psychological evaluation of the applicant's spouse, financial documentation, documentation concerning the applicant's criminal record, and evidence of the applicant's children's accomplishments.

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 (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.)

To determine if a crime involves moral turpitude, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals employs the categorical approach set forth in *Taylor v. United States*, 110 S.Ct. 2143 (1990). See *Nicanor-Romero v. Mukasey*, 523 F.3d 999, 1004 (9th Cir. 2008), *overruled on other grounds by Marmolejo-Campos v. Holder*, 58 F.3d 903, 911 (9th Cir. 2009). The purpose of the categorical approach is to determine whether the full range of conduct encompassed by the statute constitutes a crime of moral turpitude. *Cuevas-Gaspar v. Gonzalez*, 430 F.3d 1013, 1017 (9th Cir. 2005), *abrogation on other grounds recognized by Holder v. Martinez-Gutierrez*, 132 S.Ct. 2011, 2020-21 (2012). If the statute “criminalizes both conduct that does involve moral turpitude and other conduct that does not, the modified categorical approach is applied.” *Marmolejo-Campos*, 558 F.3d at 912 (citing *Fernando-Ruiz v. Gonzalez*, 466 F.3d 1121, 1163 (9th Cir. 2006)); see also *Castillo-Cruz v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 1154, 1161 (9th Cir. 2009). However, there must be “a realistic probability, not a theoretical possibility, that the statute would be applied to reach conduct that did not involve moral turpitude.” *Nicanor-Romero*, 523 F.3d at 1004 (quoting *Gonzales v. Duenas-*

*Alvarez*, 549 U.S. 183, 193 (2007). To demonstrate a “realistic probability,” the applicant must point to his or her own case or other cases in which the state courts in fact did apply the statute to conduct not involving moral turpitude. 523 F.3d at 1004-05. A realistic probability also exists where the statute expressly punishes conduct not involving moral turpitude. See *U.S. v. Vidal*, 504 F.3d 1072, 1082 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007).

Once a realistic probability is established, the modified categorical approach is applied, which requires looking to the “limited, specified set of documents” that comprise what is known as the record of conviction – the charging document, a signed plea agreement, jury instructions, guilty pleas, transcripts of a plea proceeding and the judgment – to determine if the conviction entailed admission to, or proof of, the elements of a crime involving moral turpitude. *Castillo-Cruz*, 581 F.3d at 1161 (citing *Fernando-Ruiz*, 466 F.3d at 1132-33); see also *Marmolejo-Campos*, 558 F.3d at 912 (citing *Cuevas-Gaspar*, 430 F.3d at 1020). The Ninth Circuit has reaffirmed that courts may not examine evidence outside the record of conviction in determining whether a conviction was for a crime involving moral turpitude. See *Olivas-Motta v. Holder*, --- F.3d ---, 2013 WL 2128318 (9th Cir. May 17, 2013) (rejecting *Matter of Silva-Trevino*, 24 I&N Dec. 687 (A.G. 2008)). Where the burden of proof is on the applicant, as in the present case, the applicant cannot sustain that burden where the record of conviction is inconclusive. *Young v. Holder*, 697 F.3d 976, 989 (9th Cir. 2012).

The field office director found the applicant to be inadmissible for having been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant has not disputed his inadmissibility based upon his conviction for a crime involving moral turpitude in his motion to reopen and reconsider.

The record reflects on August 24, 2004 the applicant pled guilty to misdemeanor inflicting corporal injury upon a spouse, pursuant to section 273.5(A) of the California Penal Code. The applicant was sentenced to 30 days imprisonment and 36 months of probation. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has held that a conviction under Cal. Penal Code § 273.5(a) is categorically a crime involving moral turpitude. In *Grageda v. INS*, the Ninth Circuit held, “Because spousal abuse is an act of baseness or depravity contrary to accepted moral standards, and willfulness is one of its elements . . . spousal abuse under section 273.5(a) is a crime of moral turpitude.” 12 F.3d 919, 922 (9th Cir. 1993). The record also reflects that the applicant was convicted of obtaining or retaining aid by misrepresentation in amount exceeding 400 dollars, pursuant to section 10980(c)(2) of the California Welfare and Institutions Code. The Board of Immigration Appeals has determined that a violation of this section constitutes a crime involving moral turpitude because the crime includes an intent to defraud element. *Matter of Cortez*, 25 I&N Dec. 301 (BIA 2010).

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 –

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

(i) the alien is inadmissible only under subparagraph (D)(i) or (D)(ii) of such subsection or 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 . . . .

A section 212(h) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from 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 U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse, parent, or child of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant is not considered in section 212(h) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to a qualifying relative, in this case the applicant's spouse and children. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 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.

However, based upon the elements of the applicant's conviction for inflicting corporal injury on a spouse, applicant is also subject to the heightened discretionary standard under 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d) provides, in pertinent part:

Criminal grounds of inadmissibility involving dangerous or violent crimes. The Attorney General [Secretary], in general, will not favorably exercise discretion

under section 212(h)(2) of the Act . . .in cases involving violent or dangerous crimes, except...in cases in which the 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. . . .

Cal. Penal Code § 273.5(a) provides:

(a) Any person who willfully inflicts upon a person who is his or her spouse, former spouse, cohabitant, former cohabitant, or the mother or father of his or her child, corporal injury resulting in a traumatic condition, is guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for two, three, or four years, or in a county jail for not more than one year, or by a fine of up to six thousand dollars (\$6,000) or by both that fine and imprisonment.

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). It provides that a “crime of violence,” as defined under 18 U.S.C. § 16, for which the term of imprisonment is at least one year, is an aggravated felony. As such, “crime of violence” is limited to those crimes specifically listed in 18 U.S.C. § 16. It is not a generic term with application to any crime involving violence, as that term may be commonly defined. That the DOJ chose not to use the language of section 101(a)(43)(F) of the Act or 18 U.S.C. § 16 in promulgating 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d) indicates that “violent or dangerous crimes” and “crime of violence” are not synonymous. The Department of Justice clarified the relationship between these distinct terms in the interim final rule codifying 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d):

[I]n general, individuals convicted of aggravated felonies would not warrant the Attorney General's use of this discretion. In fact, the proposed regulations stated that even if the applicant can meet the "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" standard for the exercise of discretion, depending upon the severity of the offense, this might "still be insufficient" to obtain the waiver. See 67 FR at 45407. That language would substantially limit the circumstances under which an individual convicted of an aggravated felony would be granted a waiver as a matter of discretion. Therefore, the Department believes that this language achieves the goal of the commenter while not unduly constraining the Attorney General's discretion to render waiver decisions on a case-by-case basis.

67 Fed. Reg. 78675, 78677-78 (December 26, 2002).

Therefore, the fact that a conviction constitutes an aggravated felony under the Act may be indicative that an alien has also been convicted of a violent or dangerous crime, but it is not dispositive. 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.” The AAO interprets the phrase “violent or

dangerous crimes” in accordance with the plain or common meaning of its terms, consistent with any published precedent decisions addressing discretionary denials under 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d) or the standard originally set forth in *Matter of Jean*. Given that the applicant’s crime involves actual physical attack in accordance with the plain language of the statute, the AAO finds that the applicant’s conviction renders him subject to the heightened discretionary standard of 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d).

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”. *Id.*

The exceptional and extremely unusual hardship standard is more restrictive than the extreme hardship standard. *Cortes-Castillo v. INS*, 997 F.2d 1199, 1204 (7th Cir. 1993). Since the applicant is subject to 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d), merely showing extreme hardship to his qualifying relatives under section 212(h) of the Act is not sufficient. He must meet the higher standard of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship.

The record reflects that the applicant is a 41-year-old native and citizen of Mexico. The applicant’s spouse is a 51-year-old native of Mexico and lawful permanent resident of the United States. The applicant also has six children, aged 12 to 23 years of age. The applicant is currently residing with his family in [REDACTED] California.

The applicant’s spouse asserts that she needs the applicant in her life because she loves her family very much and needs the applicant’s help in raising their children. The record contains a psychological evaluation of the applicant’s spouse dated March 21, 2012. However, the basis for the evaluation is an interview for the applicant’s 2009 I-290B filing. There is no indication that the applicant’s spouse has met with the psychologist since that date. The psychological evaluation states that the applicant’s spouse met the criteria for major depressive disorder, severe without psychotic features and generalized anxiety disorder. It is noted that there is no recommendation for treatment for the applicant’s spouse and no indication of any follow-up visits since the applicant’s spouse’s evaluation. The psychological evaluation also states that the applicant’s spouse is dependent upon the applicant for reading, writing, and understanding, related to the medications that she takes. There is no indication that the applicant’s children, all natives of the United States, would be unable to provide the applicant’s spouse with translation assistance in his absence.

The applicant’s children assert that the applicant is a wonderful father to whom they are attached and it would destroy their family if he returned to Mexico. The applicant’s children and the applicant’s spouse also assert that the applicant is the primary earner in the family, so they would be unable to pay their mortgage without his income. The applicant’s spouse contends that she only works during five months of the year, picking strawberries, and that the family relies upon

the applicant's income for the rest of the year. The applicant's stepson asserts that the applicant recently acquired a home with a \$300,000 mortgage for the whole family and that they would lose their home without the applicant's salary. It is noted that four of the applicant's children are over the age of 19 and there is evidence that several of the applicant's children are employed. The applicant's children assert that the applicant contributes the most toward the household bills, but there is no financial documentation concerning the applicant's children's earnings. The record also does not contain updated financial records for the applicant and his spouse since the submission of 2007 tax forms. There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the applicant's spouse and children would collectively be unable to maintain their financial obligations in the absence of the applicant. In the aggregate, there is insufficient evidence to find that the applicant's qualifying relatives would suffer a level of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship upon separation from the applicant

The applicant's spouse asserts that her family cannot relocate to Mexico because her children are U.S. citizens who have resided in the United States all their lives. The applicant's spouse contends that Mexico is dangerous, facing economic issues, and provides lesser medical care and education than the United States. As noted by the applicant's spouse, her children are natives and citizens of the United States and they have received or are receiving educations in the United States. The applicant's children have all submitted letters of support for the applicant, but do not make any assertions concerning their ability to relocate to Mexico. The record also does not contain any background information concerning conditions in Mexico. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence generally is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. 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)). It is noted that the applicant and his spouse are natives of Oaxaca, Mexico, and the most recent Department of State travel warnings for Mexico, dated November 20, 2012, do not contain any travel warnings for [REDACTED]. In the aggregate, the record contains insufficient evidence to find that the applicant's family would suffer exceptional and extremely unusual hardship upon relocation to Mexico.

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that the hardships faced by the applicant's family, considered in the aggregate, rise to the level of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish the requisite level of hardship and he has not shown that he merits a favorable exercise of discretion under 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d).

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 application will remain denied.

**ORDER:** The motion to reopen and reconsider is granted. The application remains denied.