

FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

COUNSEL

Maria Elena Stratton, Federal Public Defender, Richard D. Burda, Deputy Federal Public Defender, Los Angeles, Cali-

Moran-Enriquez

§ 1182(h), not § 1182(c). AEDPA section 440(d) did not in any way modify 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h). Therefore, appellee's argument that 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h) was not an available avenue of relief during Appellant's 1997 deportation is inapposite.

B. Showing prejudice.

second requirement for the collateral relief he seeks, that being "prejudice as a result of the [due process] defects." Arrieta, 224 F.3d at 1079. To demonstrate prejudice, Appellant must show that there was a " `plausible' ground for relief from deportation" if he ha4fughustuchal reliethat t timelt ."

at Muro would have been granted a § 212(h) waiver.
iciency of this showing of prejudice is directly sup-