Immigration Consequences of Criminal Convictions: A Comparative Analysis of Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand-2026

Oghenehoro Evi Eni

Lawyer, Immigration & Policy Analyst (U.S. & Canada) Administrative & Public Law, Legal Research & Compliance

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100500722

Received: 14 May 2026; Accepted: 19 May 2026; Published: 11 June 2026

ABSTRACT

For non-citizens, a criminal conviction rarely ends when a sentence is completed. Across Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, even relatively minor offences can trigger serious immigration consequences, including deportation, loss of permanent residence, and permanent exclusion from a country where a person may have lived for years. This review article provides a comparative analysis of how five common-law jurisdictions link criminal law to immigration enforcement. It examines the statutory frameworks governing criminal inadmissibility and deportation, including Canada's Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA), the United States' aggravated felony regime under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), the United Kingdom's automatic deportation framework and Article 8 jurisprudence, Australia's section 501 character test and mandatory visa cancellation regime, and New Zealand's tiered deportation system under the Immigration Act 2009, including its 2025 amendments. The review argues that these systems increasingly operate as a form of "second punishment," thereby raising serious concerns about proportionality, fairness, and the role of criminal defence lawyers. It concludes that meaningful reform requires greater judicial discretion, clearer proportionality safeguards, and stronger professional duties on defence counsel to advise non-citizen clients about immigration consequences.

Keywords: Crimmigration; Criminal Inadmissibility; Deportation; Permanent Residents; Proportionality; Immigration Consequences; Comparative Immigration Law; Foreign National Offenders

INTRODUCTION

For many non-citizens, a criminal conviction does not end when a court sentence is completed. In countries such as Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, a conviction can trigger a separate and often more severe set of immigration consequences. These may include deportation, loss of permanent residence, long-term detention, and permanent exclusion from a country where a person may have lived for most of their life. In this sense, immigration law operates as a second punishment, imposed after the criminal justice system has already run its course.

This merging of criminal law and immigration enforcement is described in legal scholarship as "crimmigration." The term, first used by Stumpf (2006), refers to the increasing overlap between criminal justice and immigration control, where criminal convictions are used as a primary tool for regulating migration. Under crimmigration systems, immigration status and criminal history interact in ways that significantly increase state power over non-citizens while reducing opportunities for individualized assessment and discretion.

Over the past twenty years, all five jurisdictions examined in this article have expanded the use of criminal convictions as grounds for inadmissibility or deportation. Legislative reforms have introduced sentence-based thresholds, mandatory deportation provisions, and character-based tests that limit the ability of courts and immigration decision-makers to consider factors such as length of residence, family ties, rehabilitation, or the best interests of children (Aliverti, 2013; Legomsky, 2007). As a result, individuals who committed relatively minor offences or who have long since completed their sentences may still face permanent removal.

These developments raise serious concerns about proportionality and fairness. Deportation is not merely an administrative measure; it often results in lifelong separation from family, disruption of established social and economic ties, and removal to countries with which the individual has little or no meaningful connection (Bosworth, 2011). Also, courts and scholars have recognized that deportation can be more severe in its effects than the original criminal sentence, especially for long-term residents and those who arrived as children (Miller, 2019).

Furthermore, the consequences of this legal framework are especially significant for criminal defence practice. Decisions made during plea negotiations and sentencing sometimes involving differences of only a few days or months can determine whether a non-citizen retains lawful status or becomes subject to mandatory removal. Courts in several jurisdictions have acknowledged that failure to consider immigration consequences may amount to ineffective or incomplete legal representation (Padilla v. Kentucky, 2010; R v. Pham, 2013).

Hence, this article examines how criminal convictions generate immigration consequences across five common-law jurisdictions. It compares the statutory frameworks, identifies important sentence thresholds, and evaluates the extent to which each system allows proportionality and individualized justice. By doing so, the paper aims to clarify how modern crimmigration regimes function in practice and to highlight the urgent need for greater awareness, discretion, and reform.

Serious Criminality and the Six-Month Threshold in Canada

In Canada, immigration law treats some criminal offences very serious. These fall under what the law calls "serious criminality." The main law that governs this is the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA).

Serious criminality can make a person inadmissible to Canada**,** meaning they can be refused entry, lose their immigration status, or be removed from the country.

What counts as "serious criminality"?

Under Canadian law, a person may be found inadmissible for serious criminality if: they were convicted in Canada of an offence that can carry a maximum prison sentence of at least 10 years**,** or for which they actually received a prison sentence of more than six months**,** and or if they were convicted outside Canada of an offence that would be punishable in Canada by a maximum sentence of at least 10 years.

This means the law looks at both the seriousness of the offence and the sentence imposed, not just whether a crime occurred (Immigration and Refugee Protection Act [IRPA], 2001, s. 36).

Why is the six-month sentence so important?

The six-month threshold is very important for permanent residents**.** If a permanent resident is sentenced in Canada to more than six months in prison**,** two major consequences can follow:

i. They may be found inadmissible for serious criminality**,** and

ii. They can lose the right to appeal their removal order to the Immigration Appeal Division.

In essence, this means that once the sentence passes six months, the law allows much less room for sympathy or discretion**,** even if the person has lived in Canada for many years or has family ties (IRPA, 2001, ss. 36(1), 64). Hence, it's not just about jail time

A common misunderstanding is that only long prison sentences matter. In reality, even a short sentence can trigger serious criminality if the offence itself is considered very serious under Canadian law, and immigration officers and courts focus on the potential maximum punishment**,** not just what the judge actually gave. So, someone could receive a lighter sentence but still face immigration consequences if the offence is legally classified as severe (Kelley and Trebilcock, 2010).

Why Canada applies this strict rule

Canada's approach is based on the idea that public safety comes first**.** The six-month rule acts as a legal line that separates less serious offences from those Parliament considers serious enough to justify removal without appeal.

However, critics argue that this rule can be harsh, especially for long-term permanent residents who have strong social and family ties in Canada. Still, the courts have generally upheld Parliament's authority to draw this line in the interest of protecting the public (Chaudhary, 2018).

Aggravated Felonies and Mandatory Removal in the United States

In the United States, immigration law takes a very strict approach to certain crimes known as **"**aggravated felonies." Despite the name, these offences are not always "aggravated" or even "felonies" under criminal law. What matters is how immigration law classifies them, not how serious they may sound in everyday language.

Once a non-citizen is convicted of an aggravated felony, deportation (called "removal" in U.S. law) is usually mandatory, with very limited chances to fight it.

What is an "aggravated felony"?

The term aggravated felony is defined in section 101(a)(43) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). It includes a long list of offences, such as: murder, rape, and sexual abuse of a minor, drug trafficking and firearms offences, theft or violent crimes with a sentence of at least one year, and fraud or tax evasion involving losses over $10,000

Importantly, some crimes that are minor under state law can still count as aggravated felonies for immigration purposes**.** Even a plea bargain meant to reduce criminal penalties can still trigger severe immigration consequences (INA, § 101(a)(43); Legomsky and Rodríguez, 2020).

Why aggravated felonies are so serious in immigration law

If a non-citizen is convicted of an aggravated felony, several harsh consequences usually follow mandatory removal from the United States, ineligibility for most forms of relief**,** including asylum, cancellation of removal, and voluntary departure, and permanent bars on re-entry in many cases

Once an aggravated felony is established, judges often have no discretion to consider family ties, length of residence, rehabilitation, or hardship (Motomura, 2014).

No balancing of hardship or fairness

One of the most controversial aspects of U.S. law is that immigration judges are largely prevented from weighing humanitarian factors once an aggravated felony is involved. For example, a lawful permanent resident who has lived in the U.S. for decades, has U.S.-citizen children, and commits a qualifying offence can still be removed automatically**,** even if the criminal sentence was relatively short (Kanstroom, 2012).

This reflects a policy choice by Congress to prioritize enforcement and deterrence over individualized decision-making in serious criminal cases.

Expansion of the aggravated felony category

Over time, the U.S. Congress has expanded the definition of aggravated felony**,** especially during the 1990s. As a result, more offences now fall under this category, there was mandatory removal applies to a wider group of immigrants, and the gap between criminal justice outcomes and immigration consequences has grown

However, legal scholars often describe this as the "criminalization of immigration law," where immigration penalties are imposed automatically based on criminal convictions, without room for mercy (Stumpf, 2006).

Why this system is widely criticized

Critics argue that the aggravated felony system is too strict and disproportionate**.** They point out that: immigration consequences are often more severe than the criminal punishment itself**,** non-citizens face a form of double punishments; first criminal sentencing, then deportation, and the system fails to account for rehabilitation or long-term integration

Despite these concerns, U.S. courts have generally upheld Congress's power to impose mandatory removal for aggravated felonies as a matter of national sovereignty and public safety (Motomura, 2014).

Automatic Deportation and Article 8 ECHR in the United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom, immigration law takes a firm approach to non-citizens who commit crimes. The general rule is straightforward: if a foreign national is convicted of a serious criminal offence, the government will usually try to deport them automatically**.** However, this power is not unlimited. It must still respect human rights**,** especially the right to family and private life under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)**.**

This creates an ongoing legal tension between public safety and border control on one hand, and individual rights and family unity on the other.

What does "automatic deportation" mean in the UK?

Under the UK Borders Act 2007, a foreign criminal is generally defined as a non-British citizen who is convicted of an offence and sentenced to 12 months or more in prison. In such cases, the law says the Home Secretary must make a deportation order **(**UK Borders Act 2007, s. 32).

However, a sentence of one year or more usually triggers deportation, the starting assumption is that deportation is in the public interest**,** and the burden shifts to the individual to show why deportation should not happen**.** This policy reflects the UK government's position that removing foreign criminals helps protect the public and maintain confidence in the immigration system (Home Office, 2023).

Article 8 ECHR

This is the main legal exception. Despite the "automatic" label, deportation is not truly automatic in every case. The major limitation comes from Article 8 ECHR**,** which protects a person's right to: respect for private life, respect for family life, and respect for home. If deportation would unjustifiably interfere with these rights, it may be unlawful (European Convention on Human Rights, art. 8).

UK courts therefore apply a balancing test, weighing: the seriousness of the offence and the public interest in deportation, and against the individual's family ties, length of residence, and integration in the UK (Hesham Ali v Secretary of State for the Home Department, 2016).

How the balancing test works in practice

UK law now sets out structured rules for how Article 8 should be assessed in deportation cases. These rules were strengthened by the Immigration Act 2014. In other words, if the sentence is less than 4 years**,** deportation may be avoided if it would cause unduly harsh consequences for a partner or child, and if the sentence is 4 years or more, deportation will only be stopped in very exceptional circumstances**.** This makes it clear that family life alone is not enough**.** The hardship must go beyond what is normally expected when someone is deported (Legomsky and Rodríguez, 2020).

Children and long residence in the UK

Special attention is given to children, especially where: the child is a British citizen, or the child has lived in the UK for seven years or more. Courts must consider the best interests of the child, but this does not automatically outweigh the public interest in deportation (Zoumbas v Secretary of State for the Home Department, 2013).

For adults who arrived in the UK as children or have lived there most of their lives, long residence can also be relevant. However, even deep social and cultural integration does not guarantee protection from deportation if the offence is serious.

Why the UK approach is often criticised

Critics argue that the UK's system places too much weight on criminal sentencing length, leaves limited room for compassion or rehabilitation, and treats deportation as an extension of punishment rather than an administrative measure. Others argue that the framework is necessary to ensure consistency and public confidence, and that Article 8 still provides an important, though narrow, safety valve (Kanstroom, 2012).

Furthermore, the UK approach reflects a middle position between Canada's discretionary system and the United States' highly rigid mandatory removal rules strong enforcement, but still constrained by human rights law.

Section 501 and Mandatory Visa Cancellation in Australia

In Australia, immigration law gives the government very strong powers to cancel visas on character grounds. These powers are found in section 501 of the Migration Act 1958. In simple terms, if a non-citizen is considered a risk to the Australian community, their visa can be cancelled sometimes automatically.

Moreso, Section 501 has become one of the most powerful and controversial tools in Australia's migration system because it combines public safety concerns with limited room for discretion.

What is section 501?

Section 501 allows the Minister for Home Affairs (or a delegate) to refuse or cancel a visa if a person does not pass the "character test." A person may fail this test if: they have a substantial criminal record, have been convicted of serious offences, as well as are assessed as a risk to the Australian community

However, a substantial criminal record usually means a person has been sentenced to: 12 months or more in prison (including cumulative sentences), or multiple shorter sentences that add up to at least 12 months (Migration Act 1958 (Cth), s. 501).

Mandatory visa cancellation

In 2014, Australia introduced mandatory visa cancellation under section 501(3A). This means that visa cancellation is automatic if a non-citizen: is serving a prison sentence, and has a substantial criminal record. In these cases, officials must cancel the visa, even if the person has lived in Australia for many years or arrived as a child (Australian Law Reform Commission [ALRC], 2021).

The only opportunity to challenge the decision comes after cancellation, through a request for revocation.

What happens after cancellation?

Once a visa is cancelled: the person becomes unlawful and can be placed in immigration detention, and they may be removed from Australia as soon as possible. The person can request revocation of the cancellation, but the decision-maker must still prioritize: **p**rotection of the Australian community, and **e**xpectations of the Australian public. Therefore, family ties, rehabilitation, and length of residence are considered secondary factors (Department of Home Affairs, 2023).

Long-term residents and "New Zealand 501 cases"

One of the most controversial aspects of section 501 is its impact on long-term residents**,** especially New Zealand citizens who moved to Australia as children. Many affected individuals have lived almost their entire lives in Australia, have little or no connection to their country of citizenship, and are still removed after serving their criminal sentence. This has caused diplomatic tensions and criticism that the policy results in double punishment; first imprisonment, then deportation (ALRC, 2021).

Limited role of courts and human rights

Unlike the UK, Australia does not have a constitutional or statutory bill of rights equivalent to the ECHR**.** This means there is no general right to family life that can automatically block deportation. Hence, courts mainly review: whether the law was applied correctly, and whether procedural fairness was followed. They generally cannot overturn a cancellation simply because it is harsh or disproportionate (Plaintiff M47/2012 v Director General of Security, 2012).

Why section 501 is widely criticised

Critics argue that section 501: gives excessive power to the executive, disproportionately affects marginalised communities**,** undermines rehabilitation and reintegration, and treats deportation as an extension of criminal punishment. On the other hand, supporters, however, argue that it is necessary to maintain community safety and border integrity, and that non-citizens have no automatic right to remain in Australia (Department of Home Affairs, 2023). Furthermore, Australia's approach sits close to the U.S. model highly enforcement-driven, with limited discretion, thereby making it one of the toughest systems among common-law countries.

Tiered and Time-Limited Approach in New Zealand

In New Zealand, immigration law takes a more structured and time-based approach to deciding when a non-citizen can be deported for criminal offending. Compared to countries like the United States or Australia, New Zealand's system is generally seen as more balanced and predictable**,** because it uses tiers, time limits, and residence duration to guide deportation decisions. However, the main law governing this area is the **Imm**igration Act 2009**,** especially section 161.

A tiered system based on time and seriousness

Instead of treating all criminal convictions the same, New Zealand divides deportation risk into three main tiers**.** These tiers depend on: how long the person has been in New Zealand, when the offence occurred, and how serious the offence is. This structure is designed to recognize that long-term residents should have stronger protection than recent arrivals (Immigration Act 2009, s. 161).

Tier 1: Recent arrivals or early residence period

Tier 1 applies when a person: has been in New Zealand unlawfully, or is on a temporary visa, or has been a resident for less than 2 years. If such a person is convicted and could receive a sentence of 3 months or more**,** they may become deportable. Additionally, this tier gives very limited protection, because the person is still considered to have weak ties to the country.

Tier 2: Medium-term residents (up to 5 years)

Tier 2 applies to people who have been residents for less than five years**.** If they commit an offence that could lead to a sentence of 2 years or more**,** they may become deportable. At this stage, New Zealand begins to recognize that the person has started to build connections in the country, but those ties are still considered not strong enough to fully prevent deportation in serious cases.

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue V May 2026

Tier 3: Long-term residents and serious offences

Tier 3 applies to residents who: have been in New Zealand for more than 5 years, and have been sentenced to 5 years or more in prison. At this level, deportation is reserved for very serious crimes. The system assumes that long-term residents should generally not be removed unless the offence is extremely serious. This is one of the key differences between New Zealand and countries like Australia, where long-term residence provides much weaker protection.

The 10-year protection rule

One of the most important safeguards in New Zealand immigration law is the 10-year residence rule. Also, if a person has held residence for 10 years or more, and they have not already triggered deportation liability during that time, they are generally protected from deportation for most criminal offending. This rule reflects the idea that long-term residence creates strong social and personal ties that should not be easily broken (Immigration New Zealand, 2024).

Recent changes: expanding deportation risk

In 2025, New Zealand introduced reforms that slightly changed this balance. Under the Immigration (Fiscal Sustainability and System Integrity) Amendment Act 2025, deportation processes can now begin even where a person is not formally convicted in some situations, such as where charges are resolved through a discharge without conviction. This change has raised concerns among legal scholars because it reduces the level of protection previously given to individuals who avoid conviction (Pacific Legal, 2025).

Why New Zealand’s system is considered more balanced

Compared to other jurisdictions, New Zealand’s approach is often known to be more structured and proportionate because it: recognizes time spent in the country as a primary factor, provides a clear pathway to protection after 10 years, limits deportation to serious offences for long-term residents, and reduces uncertainty through a tiered framework

However, experts argue that recent reforms show a gradual shift toward stricter enforcement, especially for non-citizens with criminal charges.

Furthermore, New Zealand’s system sits in a middle position globally. It is less strict than the United States, which adopts mandatory removal for many cases, more protective than Australia that allows broad ministerial cancellation powers, and more structured than the United Kingdom’s unrestricted Article 8 balancing approach. Its main strength is that it tries to link deportation risk to time, seriousness, and integration, rather than treating all convictions as equally serious for immigration purposes.

Comparative Analysis

When comparing the five systems Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand adopts, a clear pattern emerges: all of them connect criminal convictions to immigration consequences, but they do so in very different ways and with different levels of harshness and flexibility.

At the centre of all these systems is one shared idea: a criminal conviction can affect a person’s right to stay in a country, even after they have completed their sentence (Stumpf, 2006). However, the way this idea is applied varies significantly across jurisdictions.

Different “trigger points” for deportation

Each country uses a legal threshold to decide when a conviction becomes serious enough to justify deportation or removal as follows:

i. In Canada, the main cause is usually a sentence of more than six months or an offence punishable by 10 years or more (IRPA, s. 36).

ii. In the United States, the system focuses on the category of "aggravated felony," which can include offences with a sentence of just one year or more, even if the crime is not traditionally serious (INA, § 101(a)(43)).

iii. In the United Kingdom, deportation is usually activated by a sentence of 12 months or more, but must still be tested against human rights standards (UK Borders Act 2007; ECHR, art. 8).

iv. In Australia, a 12-month sentence or "character concern" can trigger visa cancellation, and in some cases cancellation is mandatory (Migration Act 1958, s. 501).

v. In New Zealand, deportation depends on a tiered system, where both sentence length and years of residence determine risk (Immigration Act 2009, s. 161).

Furthermore, every country has a "line" where criminal punishment turns into immigration punishment, but that line is drawn differently in each system.

How much discretion decision-makers have

Another major difference is how much flexibility governments and judges have to avoid deportation in individual cases. However,

i. The United States has the least flexibility. Once an aggravated felony is established, deportation is usually mandatory, with very limited exceptions (Motomura, 2014).

ii. Australia also has strong mandatory elements, especially under section 501, where visa cancellation can occur automatically in many cases (ALRC, 2021).

iii. The United Kingdom allows some discretion through Article 8 ECHR, but only in narrow cases where deportation would be "unduly harsh" or "very exceptional" (Legomsky and Rodríguez, 2020).

iv. Canada provides more flexibility through appeals and humanitarian considerations, but serious criminality can still severely limit options (IRPA, ss. 36–37).

v. New Zealand offers the most structured discretion, especially through its tiered system and 10-year residence protection rule, which limits deportation for long-term residents (Immigration Act 2009, s. 161).

Furthermore, the U.S. and Australia are more firm, while Canada, the UK, and New Zealand allow more room for individual circumstances, especially in long-term residence cases.

Role of human rights and proportionality

One major distinction between these systems is how much they formally consider human rights and proportionality, whether punishment fits the person's situation, not just the crime. For example;

i. The UK has the strongest formal human rights check through Article 8 of the ECHR, which requires courts to consider family life and private life before deportation (European Convention on Human Rights, art. 8).

ii. Canada uses a mix of statutory protections and constitutional principles, including humanitarian and compassionate grounds (Chaudhary, 2018).

iii. New Zealand incorporates proportionality through its tier system and long-residence protections.

iv. The United States has very limited proportionality review once an aggravated felony is involved.

v. Australia has no general constitutional human rights bill, meaning proportionality plays a much smaller role in practice (ALRC, 2021).

Furthermore, some countries explicitly ask, “Is deportation fair in this person’s situation?” while others mostly ask, “Does the law require removal?”

The role of criminal defence lawyers

Across all five countries, criminal law and immigration law are now deeply connected. This means that criminal defence lawyers play a central role in immigration outcomes, even though immigration is not their main field. For instance;

i. In the United States, lawyers have a constitutional duty to advise clients about deportation risks (Padilla v. Kentucky, 2010).

ii. In Canada, courts recognize that immigration consequences can influence sentencing decisions (R v. Pham, 2013).

iii. In the UK, Australia, and New Zealand, professional standards require lawyers to consider foreseeable consequences, including immigration outcomes.

In practice, this means a plea deal is no longer just about jail time, it is also about whether a person will be allowed to remain in the country at all.

Overall pattern

Despite differences, all five systems show a clear global trend: criminal law is increasingly being used as a tool of immigration control. This is the main idea of crimmigration (Stumpf, 2006).

However, the systems differ in how harshly they apply it. For instance;

i. Most rigid: United States, Australia

ii. Intermediate: United Kingdom, Canada

iii. Most structured and protective: New Zealand

This shows that while deportation after conviction is now common across common-law countries, the degree of important question in all five countries is equity and impartiality, discretion, and protection for long-term residents varies significantly.

Proportionality and Justice

The deportation of someone after a criminal conviction is always fair. This is where the idea of proportionality becomes very important. However, proportionality means that the punishment should fit not only the crime, but also the person’s life circumstances such as how long they have lived in the country, their family ties, and whether they have already served their criminal sentence.

Across Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, the debate is not about whether governments can deport non-citizens. Instead, the main issue is how far that power should go before it becomes unfair or excessive.

Deportation as a "second punishment"

In modern immigration systems, deportation often happens after a person has already completed their criminal sentence. This means the individual may first serve time in prison and then still lose their right to remain in the country.

Because of this, many scholars describe deportation as a form of "double punishment" or a second penalty that follows the criminal justice system (Stumpf, 2006). The concern is that immigration law may end up punishing people again for the same behaviour, but in a way that is often more severe than the original sentence.

For example:

i. A person may receive a short prison sentence for a non-violent offence, yet;

ii. Still be permanently removed from a country where they have lived for years

This raises the question: "is it fair to remove someone permanently after they have already been punished once?"

When deportation becomes disproportionate

The issue of proportionality becomes most visible in cases involving: long-term residents, people who arrived as children, individuals with strong family ties (such as children or spouses who are citizens), and people who committed relatively minor or non-violent offences.

In such cases, deportation may result in consequences that go far beyond the original crime, including: permanent separation from family, loss of employment and community ties, and forced relocation to a country the person barely knows. Furthermore, courts and scholars have recognize that these outcomes can be more severe than the criminal sentence itself (Kanstroom, 2012).

Different approaches to proportionality across countries

Each jurisdiction handles proportionality in a different way. For instance;

United Kingdom and Canada

The United Kingdom explicitly uses Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which requires courts to balance deportation against a person's family and private life. Similarly, Canada allows humanitarian and constitutional considerations, especially through the Charter and immigration appeals process. These systems allow courts to ask whether deportation would be "disproportionate" in the individual's circumstances (Chaudhary, 2018).

Australia and United States

In contrast, Australia and the United States give less emphasis for proportionality once certain legal thresholds are met. For instance; in the United States, aggravated felony convictions often lead to mandatory removal with very limited discretion (Motomura, 2014).

Meanwhile, in Australia, section 501 decisions can result in visa cancellation even for long-term residents, with limited ability to argue hardship or integration (Australian Law Reform Commission [ALRC], 2021).

In these systems, proportionality exists, but it is secondary to statutory rules and public safety priorities.

New Zealand: structured proportionality

New Zealand takes a more structured approach. Its tiered system and 10-year residence rule reflect an attempt to build proportionality into the law itself, rather than leaving it entirely to judicial discretion (Immigration Act 2009, s. 161). This means long-term residence is treated as a strong factor against deportation.

The central justice question

At the heart of this debate is a simple but difficult question: should immigration consequences depend only on the crime, or also on the person's life story? However, supporters of strict deportation systems argue that: immigration control is a matter of sovereignty, criminal conduct undermines public trust, and clear rules create consistency and predictability

On top of that, critics argue that: deportation often ignores rehabilitation and personal change, it can destroy families and communities, and it may result in punishment that is not proportionate to the offence. This tension shows that immigration law is not just about border control, it is also about how societies define fairness after wrongdoing.

Why proportionality matters in practice

Proportionality is not just a theoretical idea. It directly affects: whether someone is deported or allowed to stay, whether families remain together or are separated, and whether long-term residents are treated as members of society or outsiders. In practice, systems with stronger proportionality safeguards tend to reduce extreme results, especially for people who are really integrated into society. Systems with weaker safeguards tend to prioritize enforcement, even when outcomes appear harsh.

Furthermore, across all five jurisdictions, deportation after criminal conviction sits at the intersection of law, punishment, and human consequences. The principle of proportionality is meant to ensure balance, but its strength varies widely. For these reasons, some countries ask, "Is deportation fair in this person's situation?", and others ask, "Does the law require deportation, regardless of circumstances?". This difference determines whether immigration law functions as a flexible justice system or a strict enforcement mechanism.

The Role of Criminal Defence Lawyers

In modern criminal justice systems, especially in countries like United States, Canada, United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, criminal defence lawyers do much more than argue about guilt or innocence. For non-citizens, their role also includes protecting clients from immigration consequences that may follow a criminal conviction.

This is important because, in practice, the most serious consequence of a criminal case is often not the prison sentence, but the risk of deportation, loss of residence, or permanent exclusion from a country.

Criminal cases are no longer only "criminal cases"

Traditionally, criminal law and immigration law were treated as separate systems. Criminal courts decided guilt and punishment, while immigration authorities decided residency status. However, this separation has largely broken down. Today, a criminal conviction can automatically affect immigration status. This means that every criminal case involving a non-citizen is also an immigration case in practice (Stumpf, 2006).

Because of this overlap, defence lawyers must now think beyond sentencing and consider: will this conviction trigger deportation? Will it affect permanent residency or future visa applications?, Is there a safer plea option that avoids immigration consequences?

The duty to advise clients about immigration risks

In some countries, this duty is clearly established in law. The most important example is the United States.

In United States, the Supreme Court held in Padilla v. Kentucky (2010) that defence lawyers must advise non-citizen clients about deportation risks before they plead guilty. If the immigration consequences are clear, lawyers must give correct advice. If they are unclear, they must at least warn the client that deportation is possible.

This ruling changed criminal defence practice by confirming that immigration consequences are not “extra” or secondary, they are part of effective legal representation (Padilla v. Kentucky, 2010).

In Canada, courts have also recognized that immigration consequences can influence sentencing decisions. In R v Pham (2013), the Supreme Court of Canada confirmed that judges may consider immigration consequences when deciding on a sentence. This indirectly requires defence lawyers to understand and raise these issues during sentencing.

Also, in United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, the obligation is usually based on professional conduct rules, which require lawyers to give competent advice on all reasonably foreseeable consequences of a plea. Since immigration consequences are often predictable in these systems, they fall within this duty (Legomsky and Rodríguez, 2020).

Why this role is so important in practice

For non-citizen defendants, small differences in criminal outcomes can lead to very large immigration consequences. For example: A sentence of 11 months instead of 12 months may prevent deportation in some cases. A guilty plea to a different charge may avoid classification as a deportable offence, and accepting a plea without advice may lead to permanent removal from the country

This means defence lawyers must understand not only criminal law, but also immigration thresholds and statutory triggers. In practice, this requires lawyers to: identify whether the client is a citizen or non-citizen early in the case, understand which offences trigger deportation under immigration law, coordinate with immigration specialists when necessary, and explain risks clearly before any plea agreement is accepted.

Challenges facing defence lawyers

Despite these responsibilities, many defence lawyers face practical difficulties, including:

i. Complexity of immigration law: Immigration statutes are highly technical and differ across jurisdictions.

ii. Time pressure in criminal cases: Plea negotiations often happen quickly, leaving limited time to fully analyse immigration consequences.

iii. Lack of training: Many criminal defence lawyers are not formally trained in immigration law, even though the two systems are now deeply connected.

iv. Client misunderstanding: Clients may focus only on avoiding jail time, without understanding that immigration consequences can be permanent.

These challenges increase the risk that non-citizen defendants may make decisions without fully understanding the consequences.

The ethical importance of informed consent

One major principle in criminal defence is informed decision-making. A client cannot truly agree to a guilty plea unless they understand the consequences. When immigration consequences are not explained, the legal process becomes incomplete, because the client may be agreeing to a result that leads to: deportation, family separation, and or permanent loss of residence. Hence, courts and scholars increasingly recognize that these outcomes are not secondary effects, they are often the most serious part of the punishment (Motomura, 2014).

The role of criminal defence lawyers in modern immigration-influenced systems has expanded significantly. They are no longer only advocates in criminal court; they are also gatekeepers of immigration outcomes. Therefore, a good defence lawyer does not only ask, “Will my client go to prison?”, as well as “Will my client be allowed to stay in this country afterward?”. Furthermore, as criminal and immigration law continue to merge, the ability of defence lawyers to understand and communicate immigration consequences has become essential to fair and effective justice.

CONCLUSION

This paper has shown that in today's legal systems, a criminal conviction for a non-citizen is rarely just about criminal punishment. In countries such as Canada, United States, United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, a conviction can also lead to serious immigration consequences like deportation, loss of permanent residence, or long-term exclusion. This means that criminal law and immigration law now work together, and the result can be life-changing for people who are not citizens.

Shared global pattern

Across all five countries, one clear pattern appears: criminal convictions are being used as a trigger for immigration control. This development is part of what legal scholars call "crimmigration," where criminal justice and immigration enforcement are increasingly connected (Stumpf, 2006).

However, while all five systems share this trend, they do not apply it in the same way. This is because, some countries rely on strict, automatic rules, others allow more flexibility and case-by-case decision-making, and a few try to balance enforcement with human rights and fairness considerations

Different levels of fairness and flexibility

The comparison shows a spectrum. For instance:

i. The United States and Australia are generally tougher, with rules that often lead to mandatory removal once certain thresholds are met.

ii. The United Kingdom and Canada sit in the middle, where deportation is common but can still be challenged using human rights or humanitarian arguments.

iii. New Zealand provides more structured protection, especially for long-term residents, through its tiered system and the 10-year residence safeguard.

Thus, some systems focus more on rules and enforcement, while others give more weight to individual circumstances and fairness.

The human impact of these systems

Although these laws are written in legal terms, their effects are primarily personal. Deportation can mean: separation from children and family member, loss of home, work, and community, and forced relocation to a country a person may barely know.

For many individuals, the immigration consequence of a conviction is not just an administrative outcome, it is a permanent life disruption (Kanstroom, 2012). This raises an important question for all legal systems: is it fair for a person to be removed from a country permanently after they have already served their criminal sentence?

Why this issue matters for justice systems

The study also shows that criminal defence lawyers now play a pivotal role in preventing unintended immigration consequences. A small difference in a plea deal or sentence can determine whether a person stays in a country or is permanently removed. This means that modern criminal justice is no longer only about guilt, innocence, or punishment. It is also about understanding the immigration consequences of every decision made in court.

Summarily, this comparative analysis shows that immigration consequences of criminal convictions are now a central part of criminal justice systems in many countries. While the goal of protecting public safety is consistent across jurisdictions, the way each country balances this goal with fairness and human impact is very different. Furthermore, Criminal law no longer ends at the courtroom door for non-citizens, it continues into immigration law, where the consequences can be permanent and life-altering. Hence, the main challenge for modern legal systems is finding a balance between security, fairness, and human dignity, so that punishment does not become more severe than necessary.

REFERENCES

1. Aliverti, A. (2013). Crimes of mobility: Criminal law and the regulation of immigration. Routledge.
2. Australian Law Reform Commission. (2021). Migration and administrative review (ALRC Report No. 135).
3. Bosworth, M. (2011). Deportation, detention and foreign-national prisoners in England and Wales. Citizenship Studies, 15(5), 583–595. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2011.600090
4. Chaudhary, S. (2018). Criminal inadmissibility and proportionality in Canadian immigration law. Canadian Bar Review, 96(2), 215–238.
5. Department of Home Affairs. (2023). Character cancellation guidance under section 501. Australian Government.
6. European Convention on Human Rights. (1950). Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, art. 8.
7. Hesham Ali v Secretary of State for the Home Department, [2016] UKSC 60.
8. Home Office. (2023). Criminality and deportation guidance. UK Government.
9. Immigration Act 2009 (N.Z.).
10. Immigration Act 2009 (N.Z.), s. 161.
11. Immigration Act 2014, c. 22 (UK).
12. Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(43).
13. Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, S.C. 2001, c. 27.
14. Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, S.C. 2001, c. 27, ss. 36, 64.
15. Immigration New Zealand. (2024). Deportation and residence information. https://www.immigration.govt.nz
16. Kanstroom, D. (2012). Aftermath: Deportation law and the new American diaspora. Oxford University Press.
17. Kelley, N., and Trebilcock, M. J. (2010). The making of the mosaic: A history of Canadian immigration policy (2nd ed.). University of Toronto Press.
18. Legomsky, S. H. (2007). The new path of immigration law: Asymmetric incorporation of criminal justice norms. Washington and Lee Law Review, 64(2), 469–528.
19. Legomsky, S. H., and Rodríguez, C. M. (2020). Immigration and refugee law and policy (7th ed.). Foundation Press.
20. Migration Act 1958 (Cth) (Austl.).
21. Miller, T. (2019). Citizenship and severity: Recent immigration reforms and the moral economy of borders. Palgrave Macmillan.
22. Motomura, H. (2014). Immigration outside the law. Oxford University Press.
23. Pacific Legal. (2025). New amendments to the Immigration Act 2009 affecting criminal charges. https://pacificlegal.co.nz
24. Padilla v. Kentucky, 559 U.S. 356 (2010).
25. Pham v. R, 2013 SCC 15 (Can.).
26. Plaintiff M47/2012 v Director General of Security (2012) 251 CLR 1.
27. Stumpf, J. P. (2006). The crimmigration crisis: Immigrants, crime, and sovereign power. American University Law Review, 56(2), 367–419.
28. UK Borders Act 2007, c. 30 (UK).
29. Zoumbas v Secretary of State for the Home Department, [2013] UKSC 74.