

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

(b)(6)

[REDACTED]

Date: **APR 07 2014**

Office: BOSTON [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 (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,


f3
Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Boston, Massachusetts. A notice of intent to dismiss the appeal was issued by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of El Salvador 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 applicant is applying for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen son and parents.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated July 23, 2012.

On January 2, 2014, the AAO gave the applicant notice of its intent to dismiss the appeal and granted the applicant thirty (30) days from the date of the notice to respond. The AAO noted that if the applicant did not respond within the allotted time period, the AAO would dismiss the appeal. *See Notice of Intent to Dismiss*, dated January 2, 2014. As of today, the AAO has not received a response from applicant or counsel.

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) a violation of (or conspiracy or attempt to violate) any law or regulation of a State, the United States, or a foreign country relating to a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)), 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 record reflects that in November 1998, the applicant was charged with Assault and Battery with a Dangerous Weapon, a violation of chapter 265 of the Massachusetts General Laws. The applicant was convicted of the charges in February 1999. The field office director found the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(A)(i)(I) of the Act, for having been convicted of a crime of moral turpitude. On appeal, the applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility and the AAO will not disturb that determination on appeal. The applicant requires a waiver under section 212(h) of the Act.

Section 212(h) of the Act provides, in pertinent parts:

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 alien is inadmissible occurred more than 15 years before the date of the alien'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 activity for which the applicant was found inadmissible occurred more than 15 years ago, he is now eligible for a waiver 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. However, even if the applicant establishes that he meets the requirements of section 212(h)(1)(A), we cannot favorably exercise discretion in the applicant's case except in an extraordinary circumstance. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d).

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 dependent 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 the crime for which the applicant was convicted, which proscribes the intention to do physical harm to a victim by means of a dangerous weapon, a violent and dangerous crime within the meaning of 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d), and the heightened discretionary standards found in that regulation are applicable in this case. 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” to a qualifying relative. *Id.*

In *Matter of Monreal-Aguinaga*, 23 I&N Dec. 56, 62 (BIA 2001), the BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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.”). The AAO notes that exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to a qualifying relative must be established in the event that he or she accompanies the applicant or in the event that he or she remains in the United States, as a qualifying relative is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant’s waiver request.

Although 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d) does not specifically state to whom the applicant must demonstrate exceptional and extremely unusual hardship, the AAO interprets this phrase to be limited to qualifying relatives described under the corresponding waiver provision of 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.

The applicant contends that his U.S. citizen son, born in 1997, and his U.S. citizen parents would experience extreme hardship were they to remain in the United States while he relocates abroad as a result of inadmissibility. To begin, the applicant explains that both he and his son’s mother, [REDACTED] have a history of prior depressive illness that would make his son more likely to suffer from depression and anxiety in the event of a significant or major life stressor. Further, the applicant details that were he to return to El Salvador, he would not be able to obtain gainful employment and the responsibility for his son’s financial wellbeing would fall on his mother, who is presently unemployed. In addition, the applicant states that due to the problematic country conditions in El Salvador, his parents and son would be worried about his safety at all time. Moreover, the applicant contends that his parents would be distraught if he had to return to El Salvador due to the fact that he provides emotional, financial and physical support to them. *See Affidavit from [REDACTED]* dated February 6, 2012.

Although the AAO acknowledges the applicant's contention that his son and parents will experience emotional hardship were they to remain in the United States while he relocates abroad, the record does not establish the severity of this hardship or the effects on their daily lives. Nor has the applicant provided any supporting documentation to establish that he would be unable to obtain gainful employment or be in any specific danger in El Salvador. Further, the record establishes that the applicant's son's mother is gainfully employed as a home health aide. The applicant has not established that she would not be able to support her son and maintain the family home while the applicant resides abroad. Moreover, the record establishes that the applicant's son's mother is actively involved in his daily life and the applicant has five adult siblings residing in the United States. It has not been established that this support network would not be able to assist the applicant's son and parents should the need arise. 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)). When all of the alleged hardship factors are considered in the aggregate, the AAO finds that the hardship endured by the applicant's son and parents as a result of separation from the applicant does not meet the "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" standard set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(d).

In regard to relocating abroad to reside with the applicant as a result of his inadmissibility, hardship to the applicant's parents has not been addressed. The applicant has thus not established that the applicant's parents would experience exceptional and extremely unusual hardship were they to return to El Salvador, their native country. As for the applicant's son, the applicant states that his son would be a target for recruitment by numerous gangs in El Salvador. Further, the applicant details that his son is doing very well in school in the United States and a disruption in his schooling would cause him hardship. Moreover, the applicant details that his son is unfamiliar with the country, culture and customs. The record establishes that the applicant's son, currently 16 years old, is fully integrated into the United States lifestyle and educational system. The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) found that a fifteen-year-old child who lived her entire life in the United States, who was completely integrated into the American lifestyle, and who was not fluent in Chinese, would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to Taiwan. *Matter of Kao and Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45 (BIA 2001). The AAO finds *Matter of Kao and Lin* to be persuasive in this case due to the similar fact pattern. To uproot the applicant's teenage son at this stage of his education and social development and relocate to El Salvador would constitute exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to him. Further, the AAO notes that the U.S. Government continues to grant El Salvadorans living in the United States Temporary Protected Status (TPS), thus confirming the difficult conditions in El Salvador. Finally, a Travel Warning has been issued for El Salvador, noting that crime and violence, including extortion, kidnapping, and gang violence, remain critically high and the country has one of the highest per capita murder rates in the world. *Travel Warning-El Salvador*, U.S. Department of State, dated August 9, 2013. It has thus been established that the applicant's son would suffer exceptional and extremely unusual hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility.

The record, reviewed in its entirety, does not support a finding that the applicant's parents or son will face exceptional and extremely unusual hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Rather, the record demonstrates that they will face no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a son or parent is removed from the United States or is refused admission. There is no documentation establishing that the applicant's parents' or son's hardships are any different from other families separated as a result of immigration violations. Although the AAO is not insensitive to the applicant's parents' and son's situation, the record does not establish that the hardships they would face rise to the level of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship as contemplated by statute and case law. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In application proceedings, it is the applicant's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.