

(b)(6)


U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

Date: **MAY 09 2013**

Office: LONDON, ENGLAND

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) and under Section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

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 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg", with a long, sweeping underline.

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, London, England. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the United Kingdom 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 been convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude. The applicant was also found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure entry into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The record indicates that the applicant is the fiancée of a United States citizen. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility to reside in the United States with his fiancée.

In a decision dated July 27, 2012, the district director found that the applicant had established that extreme hardship would be imposed on his U.S. citizen fiancée as a result of his inadmissibility, but that the applicant did not warrant the favorable exercise of discretion. The Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) was denied accordingly.

In a Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B), dated July 5, 2012, the applicant's fiancée requests that the district director's decision on discretion be reconsidered. She states that she is suffering extreme hardship and that the applicant has been rehabilitated.

The applicant has a record of nine convictions. These include: "being carried in a stolen vehicle where damage below 5,000 pounds" on February 4, 1998; assault and "using threatening, abusive, insulting words or behavior with the intent to cause fear or provocation of violence" on December 2, 1998; assault on December 16, 1998; burglary and theft of a dwelling, taking a conveyance without authority, breach of conditional discharge, and assault on June 11, 1999; and battery on January 29, 2009.

The record indicates that on May 28, 2003 and January 22, 2005 the applicant entered the United States under the Visa Waiver Program and on the required Form I-94 the applicant answered "no" to the question, "have you ever been arrested or convicted for an offense or crime involving moral turpitude or a violation related to a controlled substance; or been arrested or convicted for two or more offenses for which the aggregate sentence to confinement was five years."

On February 11, 2010, the applicant attempted to enter the United States under the Visa Waiver Program, but was refused entry after questioning by Customs and Border Protection revealed he had overstayed his authorized period of stay by three days after his January 2005 entry and he had worked without authorization while in the United States.

In addition, on March 5, 2011, the applicant filed a Nonimmigrant Visa Application (Form DS-156) for the purposes of obtaining a K-1 fiancé visa, stating "no" to the questions, "have you ever been arrested or convicted for any offense or crime, even though subject to a pardon,

amnesty, or other similar legal action,” and “have you ever been refused admission to the United States....”

The record of hardship includes: a statement from the applicant, a statement from the applicant’s fiancée, statements from the applicant’s fiancée’s family, financial documentation, medical documentation, and educational documentation.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

- (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

The AAO finds that the applicant’s failure to disclose his criminal convictions on his Form I-94W and Form DS-156 and his refused admission on his Form DC-156 were willful misrepresentations under 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. In her statement, the applicant’s spouse asserts that the applicant did not intend to make a misrepresentation as he did not know the meaning of moral turpitude and he submitted all of his criminal records to the Vermont Service Center and the U.S. Embassy in London. She does not address his failure to disclose his refused admission in 2010.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services interprets the term “willfully” as knowingly and intentionally, as distinguished from accidentally, inadvertently, or in an honest belief that the factual claims are true. In order to find the element of willfulness, it must be determined that the alien was fully aware of the nature of the information sought and knowingly, intentionally, and deliberately misrepresented material facts. *See generally Matter of G-G-*, 7 I&N Dec. 161 (BIA 1956). To be willful, a misrepresentation must be made with knowledge of its falsity. 7 I&N Dec. at 164. To determine whether a misrepresentation was willful, we examine the circumstances as they existed at the time of the misrepresentation, and we “closely scrutinize the factual basis” of a finding of inadmissibility for fraud or misrepresentation because such a finding “perpetually bars an alien from admission.” *Matter of Y-G-*, 20 I&N Dec. 794, 796-97 (BIA 1994) (citing *Matter of Shirdel*, 19 I&N Dec. 33, 34-35 (BIA 1984)); *see also Matter of Healy and Goodchild*, 17 I&N Dec. 22, 28-29 (BIA 1979). With relevance to the present matter, we acknowledge that the term “moral turpitude” is not in common usage, and it is unlikely that the average person is aware of its meaning and application in U.S. immigration law. Nevertheless, as the burden is on the applicant to establish that he or she is not inadmissible, the applicant has the burden of showing that any misrepresentation was, in fact, not willful. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Thus, the AAO finds that the applicant is inadmissible under 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act because his misrepresentations were willful.

The applicant is also inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A) of the Act as a result of his convictions.

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 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 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.)

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.

As stated previously, the record indicates that the applicant has a record of nine convictions. These include: “being carried in a stolen vehicle where damage below 5,000 pounds” on February 4, 1998; assault and “using threatening, abusive, insulting words or behavior with the intent to cause fear or provocation of violence” on December 2, 1998; assault on December 16, 1998; burglary and theft of a dwelling, taking a conveyance without authority, breach of conditional discharge, and assault on June 11, 1999; and battery on January 29, 2009.

It is noted that as a general rule, simple assault or battery is not deemed to involve moral turpitude for purposes of the immigration laws. *Matter of Fualau*, 21 I&N Dec. 475, 477 (BIA 1996). However, the applicant’s convictions for “using threatening, abusive, insulting words or behavior with the intent to cause fear or provocation of violence” and burglary and theft of a

dwelling are crimes involving moral turpitude.

In *Matter of Ajami*, the BIA addressed whether a stalking offense that involves the making of credible threats against another constitutes a crime involving moral turpitude. 22 I&N Dec. 949 (BIA 1999). The BIA concluded that “the intentional transmission of threats is evidence of a vicious motive or a corrupt mind,” and a crime encompassing such conduct involves moral turpitude. 22 I&N Dec. 949, 952. In addition, the 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). 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).

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 –

....

(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 . . . .

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

(1) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) 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 or parent of the applicant. A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(h) 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, or child of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant can be considered only insofar as it

results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's fiancée is the only qualifying relative 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. *Salcido-Salcido v. I.N.S.*, 138 F.3d 1292 (9th Cir. 1998)(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 his decision, the district director found that the applicant's fiancée would suffer extreme hardship because her son suffers from a learning disability and she would not be able to relocate with her son because she shares custody of him with his biological father. We affirm the field office director's decision regarding extreme hardship to the applicant's fiancée upon relocation due to separation from her son. However, we do not find that she has shown that she is suffering extreme hardship as a result of separation. The medical documentation submitted does not indicate that she is suffering above and beyond what would normally be expected as a result of being separated from an immediate family member.

We can find extreme hardship warranting a waiver of inadmissibility only where an applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the scenario of separation *and* the scenario of relocation. A claim that a qualifying relative will relocate and thereby suffer extreme hardship can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no actual intention to relocate. Cf. *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to relocate and suffer extreme hardship, where remaining in the United States and being separated from the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, also cf. *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship from separation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the qualifying relative in this case.

Furthermore, we affirm the field office director's decision regarding the applicant not warranting the favorable exercise of discretion. The favorable factors in the applicant's case are his U.S. citizen fiancée and the hardship she would suffer as a result of having to relocate to the United Kingdom.

The unfavorable factors in the applicant's case include his long history of criminal convictions and immigration violations. His record includes convictions occurring in 1998, 1999, and in 2009.

We also note that his conviction for burglary of a dwelling may be considered a dangerous crime under section 212.7(d) of the Act.<sup>1</sup>

In addition, his most recent offense, which occurred in 2009, was a domestic violence offense involving his pregnant ex-partner. Records submitted on appeal by his fiancée indicate that the applicant has not been rehabilitated. The Offender Assessment, submitted on appeal and dated January 26, 2010, indicates that the applicant has been uncooperative and resistant to complying with his probation. This assessment also states that he is resistant to addressing his domestic violence issues and blames his former partner for the delay in his being able to come to the United States. Moreover, the assessment indicates that the applicant is not motivated to address his offending and does not have the capacity to change and reduce his criminal conduct. Thus, we find that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweigh the favorable factors such that he does not warrant the favorable exercise of discretion.

The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish eligibility for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) and section 212(h) of the Act.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) and 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. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.