

Challenging Crime-based Removability

ERICA SCHOMMER

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY IMMIGRATION AND
HUMAN RIGHTS CLINIC




Criminal Defense of Immigrants


Pre-Padilla v. Kentucky

- Immigration a collateral consequence, or
- Affirmative mis-advice considered ineffective assistance

Padilla v. Kentucky, 130 S.Ct. 1473 (2010)

- Recognized dramatic changes in immigration law
 - Sixth Amendment right to be informed whether “plea carries risk of deportation”.
 - Applied standards set in *Strickland v. Washington*
- 

Myths— Immigration Consequences

- The client did not plea to a felony; it was just a misdemeanor.
 - The client served probation (or jail time for less than 6 months).
 - The client was not convicted (or the conviction doesn't count under state law).
 - The 5th Circuit, or the BIA, already held that the conviction was not a deportable offense.
- 

Also available as part of the eCourse

[Challenging Crime-Based Grounds of Deportability](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
2022 A Practical Guide to Immigration Removal Proceedings session
"Challenging Crime-Based Grounds of Deportability"