U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

H2

FILE: [redacted] Office: DENVER, COLORADO Date: MAY 13 2004

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:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Denver, Colorado, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Algeria who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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 the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative as the spouse of a U.S. citizen. He now seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), so that he may remain in the United States and reside with his U.S. citizen spouse.

The District Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish either that extreme hardship would be imposed upon his spouse or that he has been rehabilitated. The application was denied accordingly. *See District Director's Decision* dated February 28, 2003.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant did not understand the necessity of submitting supporting evidence in order to establish hardship when he filed the Form I-601. With the appeal counsel submits a brief, a mental health evaluation of the applicant's spouse and affidavits from friends.

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

> (A)(i) [A]ny alien convicted of, or who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of-
>
> (I) a crime involving moral turpitude (other than a purely political offense) or an attempt or conspiracy to commit such a crime . . . is inadmissible.
>
> . . . .

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

> (h) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security, "Secretary"] may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraphs (A)(i)(I) . . . of subsection (a)(2) . . . if -
>
> . . . .
>
> (1) (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 reflects that on September 15, 1995, in the United States District Court of the Western District of Missouri the applicant was convicted of Aiding and Abetting in the Trafficking of Counterfeit Goods (Similac Infant Formula). The applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act, due to his conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude.

Section 212(h) of the Act provides that a 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 on a qualifying family member. 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).

In the present case, the applicant must demonstrate extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse.

Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the BIA deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These 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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that extreme hardship would be imposed to the applicant's spouse (Ms. if the waiver application was denied. Affidavits submitted by the applicants friends state that he is a hard working individual of good moral character. A mental health evaluation conducted by a psychotherapist was submitted which states that Ms suffers from post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and depression. The evaluation was based on one visit and states that Ms PTSD symptoms are due to previous experiences dating back to 1984 and 1988 when she married her first husband and when she lived in Lebanon with her second husband. The evaluation states that Ms. suffers from hair loss, nightmares, migraine headaches, and that she is afraid that her husband will be deported and returned to Algeria. In addition it states that she has lost confidence and is unable to go out in order to find a job. The March 16, 2003, evaluation recommends that Ms. eceive psychological treatment for her symptoms of PTSD to reduce her anxiety and depression. The psychotherapist's evaluation does not mention if her condition can be treated in Algeria if she decides to relocate. Nor is there any indication that Ms. followed the recommendation.

In her affidavit Ms states if the applicant is not permitted to reside in the United States she will follow him without hesitation but she cannot imagine living apart from her mother and brother for an extensive period of time. Ms. further states that she wishes to have a child with the applicant, that the applicant regrets the activities that led to his conviction and that he has been rehabilitated by becoming very observant and rededicating himself to the Muslim faith. The record reflects that Ms. speaks Arabic and no reason was provided, other than general hardship as to why she would not be able to adjust to life in Algeria is she decides to relocate with the applicant in Algeria.

There are no laws that require Ms. to leave the United States and live abroad. In *Silverman v. Rogers*, 437 F. 2d 102 (1st Cir. 1970), the court stated that, "even assuming that the Federal Government had no right either to prevent a marriage or destroy it, we believe that here it has done nothing more than to say that the residence of one of the marriage partners may not be in the United States." The uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported. *See Shooshtary v. INS,* 39 F. 3d 1049 (9th Cir. 1994).

U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS,* 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). For example, *Matter of*

Pilch, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS,* 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined "extreme hardship" as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *Hassan v. INS, supra,* held further that the uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported. The U.S. Supreme Court additionally held in *INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality reflects that the applicant has failed to show that his U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he were not allowed to remain in the United States at this time. 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 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 appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.