PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA Date: FEB 04 2004

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Permanent Residence Pursuant to Section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966 (P.L. 89-732)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT: SELF-REPRESENTED

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 application was denied by the Acting District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for review. The acting district director's decision will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Ecuador who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act (CAA) of November 2, 1966. This Act provides, in pertinent part:

> [T]he status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959 and has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, may be adjusted by the Attorney General, (now the Secretary of Homeland Security, (Secretary)), in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien makes an application for such adjustment, and the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to the spouse and child of any alien described in this subsection, regardless of their citizenship and place of birth, who are residing with such alien in the United States.

The acting district director determined that the applicant was not eligible for adjustment of status as the child of a native or citizen of Cuba, pursuant to section 1 of the CAA of November 2, 1966, because her father's marriage to a native or citizen of Cuba was deemed invalid and she cannot derive immigration benefits from it. *See Acting District Director's Decision* dated August 19, 2003.

The record reflects that on September 23, 2002, at Miami, Florida, the applicant's father married [redacted] a native and citizen of Cuba whose immigration status was adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident of the United States, pursuant to section 1 of the CAA. Based on that marriage, on November 26, 2002, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

The record reflects that on July 8, 2003, the applicant's father presented a divorce decree from the applicant's mother issued in Guayaquil, Ecuador dated November 8, 2001 and stated that he and his ex-wife were residing in Miami, Florida at the time of the divorce proceedings took place in Ecuador.

In *Matter of Weaver*, 19 I&N Dec. 730 (BIA 1979), the Board of Immigration Appeals held that the validity of a divorce entered into while neither party to it is domiciled in the place where it was granted, but where both parties appeared for the divorce, should be judged by the law of the jurisdiction where the parties to the divorce were domiciled at the time of the divorce. In this case both parties to the divorce were residing in Miami, Florida during the time of the divorce. It has long been held that Florida courts will not recognize a foreign nation's divorce decree unless at least one of the spouses was a good faith domiciliary of the foreign nation at the time the decree was rendered.

The acting district director determined that the divorce decree presented by the applicant's father was not valid for immigration purposes and his present marriage cannot be considered valid under immigration law. Therefore the claimed relationship between the applicant and Ms [redacted] s not valid and the application for adjustment of status was denied accordingly.

On notice of certification, the applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the acting district director's findings. No additional evidence has been entered into the record.

Pursuant to section 291 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that she is eligible for adjustment of status. She has failed to meet that burden.

The decision of the acting district director to deny the application will be affirmed.

ORDER: The acting district director's decision is affirmed.