

# 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"