



B9

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

[Redacted] ing data deleted to
[Redacted] clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

FILE: [Redacted]
EAC 01 019 54339

Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: DEC 08 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

[Redacted]

APPLICATION: Petition for Special Immigrant Battered Spouse Pursuant to Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: Self-represented

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The case will be remanded to the director for further action.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of England who is seeking classification as a special immigrant pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii), as the battered spouse of a United States citizen.

The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish that she is the spouse of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(A) because she was divorced from her allegedly abusive spouse prior to the filing of the self-petition. The director, therefore, denied the petition.

On appeal, the petitioner asserts that she was given incorrect advice by the San Antonio Service office regarding the order of the divorce and the filing of the Form I-360 petition.

The record reflects that the petitioner entered the United States as a B-2 visitor on July 26, 1994. The petitioner married her United States citizen spouse in Williamson County, Texas, on March 22, 1997. The petitioner subsequently petitioned for dissolution of the marriage, and the judgment of divorce became effective on September 7, 2000. On November 6, 2000, a self-petition was filed by the petitioner claiming eligibility as a special immigrant alien who has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, her U.S. citizen spouse during their marriage.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(ii), the self-petitioning spouse must be legally married to the abuser when the petition is properly filed with the Service. A spousal self-petition must be denied if the marriage to the abuser legally ended through annulment, death, or divorce before that time.

The director denied the petition after determining that the petitioner failed to establish eligibility for the benefit sought because she was divorced from her U.S. citizen spouse on September 7, 2000, prior to the filing of the self-petition on November 6, 2000.

On October 28, 2000, the President approved enactment of the Violence Against Women Act, 2000, Pub. L. No. 106-386, Division B, 114 Stat. 1464, 1491 (2000). Section 1503(b) amends section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act so that an alien self-petitioner

claiming to qualify for immigration as the battered spouse or child of a United States citizen is no longer required to be married to the alleged abuser at the time the petition is filed as long as the petitioner can show a connection between the legal termination of the marriage within the past 2 years and battering or extreme cruelty by the United States citizen spouse. Id. section 1503(b), 114 Stat. at 1520-21. Pub. L. 106-386 does not specify an effective date for the amendments made by section 1503. This lack of an effective date strongly suggests that the amendments entered into force on the date of enactment. Johnson v. United States, 529 U.S. 694, 702 (2000); Gozlon-Peretz v. United States, 498 U.S. 395, 404 (1991).

As a general rule, an administrative agency must decide a case according to the law as it exists on the date of the decision. Bradley v. Richmond School Board, 416 U.S. 696, 710-11 (1974); United States v. The Schooner Peggy, 1 Cranch 103, 110 (1801); Matter of Soriano, 21 I & N Dec. 516 (BIA 1996, AG 1997); Matter of Alarcon, 20 I & N Dec. 557 (BIA 1992). For immigrant visa petitions, however, the Board has held that, to establish a priority date, the beneficiary must have been fully qualified for the visa classification on the date of filing. Matter of Atembe, 19 I & N Dec. 427 (BIA 1986); Matter of Drigo, 18 I & N Dec. 223 (BIA 1982); Matter of Bardouille, 18 I & N Dec. 114 (BIA 1981). Even if the law changes in a way that may benefit the beneficiary, the appeal must be denied, without prejudice to the filing of a new petition, to ensure that the beneficiary does not gain an advantage over the beneficiaries of other petitions. Id.

Atembe, Drigo, and Bardouille each involved petitions under the family-based preference categories in section 203(a) of the Act. In this case, however, the beneficiary seeks classification as the spouse of a citizen. INA section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii), 8 U.S.C. section 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii), as amended by Pub. L. No. 106-386, section 1503, supra. As immediate relatives, the spouses and children of citizens are not subject to the numerical limits on immigration, and do not need priority dates. INA section 201(b)(2)(A)(i), 8 U.S.C. section 1151(b)(2)(A)(i). The purpose of the Atembe, Drigo and Bardouille decisions would not be served by dismissing the appeal in this case. For this reason, the appeal will be decided on the basis of section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) as amended by section 1503.

The record reflects that the petitioner and her U. S. citizen spouse divorced on September 7, 2000, less than two years prior to the filing of the self-petition. The court, in this case, ordered and decreed that the marriage between the petitioner and Mr. Martin be "dissolved on the grounds of cruelty and abuse."

The record reflects that there appears to be a connection between the legal termination of the marriage within the past 2 years and battering or extreme cruelty by the U. S. citizen spouse. The case, however, will be remanded so that the director may review the record of proceeding to determine whether all other criteria listed in 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1) are satisfied. The director shall enter a new decision which, if adverse to the petitioner, is to be certified to the Associate Commissioner, Examinations, for review, and without fee.

ORDER: The director's decision is withdrawn. The case is remanded for appropriate action consistent with the above discussion and entry of a new decision.