

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



tt5

Date: **OCT 03 2011**

Office: NEWARK, NJ

FILE: 

IN RE: 

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i) and 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.

Thank you,

for Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Newark, New Jersey. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Peru who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation on January 19, 2002. The applicant was also found to be inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(I), as an alien convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude.

In a decision dated July 23, 2008, the field office director found the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act after failing to disclose her criminal record on her adjustment application, dated January 19, 2002. The field office director also found the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act for having been convicted under New Jersey State Criminal Code section 2C:21-17(A)(1) and 2C:21-17(A)(4) for Theft of Identity. The field office director then found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative as a result of her inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly.

In a Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B), dated August 22, 2008, counsel states that the field office director's decision was incorrect as a matter of law and fact. He states that if the applicant is required to leave the United States her elderly and seriously ill mother, for whom the applicant is the sole caregiver, would suffer extreme hardship.

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.)

In determining whether a crime involves moral turpitude, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, per *Jean-Louis v. Holder*, 582 F.3d 462 (3rd Cir. 2009), makes a categorical inquiry, which consists of looking “to the elements of the statutory offense . . . to ascertain that least culpable conduct hypothetically necessary to sustain a conviction under the statute.” *Id.* at 465-66. The “inquiry concludes when we determine whether the least culpable conduct sufficient to sustain conviction under the statute “fits” within the requirements of a CIMT.” *Id.* at 470.

However, if the “statute of conviction contains disjunctive elements, some of which are sufficient for conviction of [a CIMT] and other of which are not . . . [an adjudicator] examin[es] the record of conviction for the narrow purpose of determining the specific subpart under which the defendant was convicted.” *Id.* at 466. This is true “even where clear sectional divisions do not delineate the statutory variations.” *Id.* In so doing, an adjudicator may only look at the formal record of conviction. *Id.*

The record indicates that on June 22, 2001 the applicant was convicted of theft of identity under New Jersey Criminal Code sections 2C:21-17(A)(1) and 2C:21-17(A)(4) for events that occurred on or around March 9, 2001. The applicant was sentenced to three years probation. A conviction in the third degree under this section of the Code carries a maximum sentence of five years imprisonment. The applicant, who was born on March 1, 1952, was forty-nine years old at the time of her conviction.

New Jersey Criminal Code section 2C:21-17(A) states, in pertinent part:

a. A person is guilty of an offense if the person:

(1) Impersonates another or assumes a false identity and does an act in such assumed character or false identity for the purpose of obtaining a benefit for himself or another or to injure or defraud another;

...

(4) Obtains any personal identifying information pertaining to another person and uses that information, or assists another person in using the information, in order to assume the identity of or represent himself as another person, without that person's authorization and with the purpose to fraudulently obtain or attempt to obtain a benefit or services, or avoid the payment of debt or other legal obligation or avoid prosecution for a crime by using the name of the other person;

The AAO notes that New Jersey Criminal Code sections 2C:21-17(A)(1) and 2C:21-17(A)(4) include two basic elements: 1. representing or impersonating oneself as another person and 2. using this false identity to gain some sort of benefit. Thus, the statute includes elements of offenses involving the intent to defraud and elements of offenses involving only deception. The AAO finds that any crime involving fraud is a crime involving moral turpitude. *Burr v. INS*, 350 F.2d 87, 91 (9th Cir. 1965), *cert denied*, 383 U.S. 915 (1966). Furthermore, in *Nugent v. Ashcroft*, the Third Circuit held that theft by deception under Pennsylvania Statutes constituted a crime involving moral turpitude. 367 F.3d 162, 165 (3rd Cir. 2004). The AAO also finds that the Board of Immigration Appeals has found, in a case involving the sale of false alien registration papers that the crime entailed a deliberate deception and was thus inherently fraudulent and was a crime involving moral turpitude. *Matter of Flores*, 17 I&N Dec. 225 (BIA 1980). We find that the applicant's conviction for theft of identity under New Jersey Criminal Code sections 2C:21-17(A)(1) and 2C:21-17(A)(4) constitutes a crime involving moral turpitude.

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

The record also indicates that on her adjustment application, dated January 19, 2002 and filed on February 8, 2002, the applicant failed to disclose her criminal convictions by answering “no” to every question pertaining to her having a criminal record. The AAO notes that the applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility.

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.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that:

- (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 section 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act dependent upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse and/or parent of the applicant. A section 212(h) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(2)(A) of the Act is dependent upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse, parent and/or child of the applicant. Hardship the applicant experiences due to her inadmissibility is not considered in section 212(i) or section 212(h) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to the applicant’s qualifying relatives. The only qualifying relative in the applicant’s case is the applicant’s U.S. citizen mother. 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 deportation, 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. at 631-32; *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 883; *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.*

We observe that 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., In re 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). Therefore, 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).

The record of hardship includes: a statement from the applicant's mother, medical documentation, financial documentation, and country reports on conditions in Peru.

In his Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B), counsel states that the applicant and her mother live together and that the applicant is her mother's sole caregiver. He states that they have been

living together for the passed sixteen years and that the applicant's mother is incapable of caring for herself. Counsel also states that the age of the applicant's mother; the conditions existing in Peru; the state of, access to and cost of medical care in Peru; and the emotional and psychological stressors of moving to Peru would result in the applicant's mother's medical conditions deteriorating.

The AAO notes that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records reveal that the applicant's U.S. citizen mother died in June 2010. The record does include statements from the applicant's mother in support of her daughter's waiver application. In her statement, dated November 17, 2004, the applicant's mother described the medical problems she suffered over the years and how her daughter was her sole caretaker.

In the event that a qualifying relative dies before a final decision is made on an applicant's waiver application, it is USCIS policy to treat the qualifying relative's death as the equivalent of a finding of extreme hardship to that relative. In addition, the AAO finds that when the applicant's appeal was filed, the record supported an approval of her waiver application in that her mother was almost ninety years old, suffered from various medical problems, and relied on the applicant for her daily care.

The AAO additionally finds that the applicant merits a waiver of inadmissibility as a matter of discretion. In discretionary matters, the applicant bears the burden of proving eligibility in terms of equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. *See Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). The BIA has stated:

In evaluating whether section 212(h)(1)(B) relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the factors adverse to the alien include the nature and underlying circumstances of the exclusion ground at issue, the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws, the existence of a criminal record, and if so, its nature and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of the alien's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country. The favorable considerations include family ties in the United States, residence of long duration in this country (particularly where alien began residency at a young age), evidence of hardship to the alien and his family if he is excluded and deported, service in this country's Armed Forces, a history of stable employment, the existence of property or business ties, evidence of value or service in the community, evidence of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and other evidence attesting to the alien's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends and responsible community representatives).

Matter of Mendez-Morales, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). The AAO must then, "[B]alance the adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented on the alien's behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of the country. " *Id.* at 300. (Citations omitted).

The adverse factors in the present case are the applicant's criminal record and her not disclosing her conviction on her adjustment application. The favorable factors in the present case are the support the applicant provided to her mother and the lack of any criminal record for over ten years.

The AAO finds that the applicant has established that the favorable factors in her application outweigh the unfavorable factors. In discretionary matters, the applicant bears the full burden of proving her eligibility for discretionary relief. *See Matter of Ducret*, 15 I&N Dec. 620 (BIA 1976). Here, the applicant has now met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained and the application is approved.