



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



deleted to
unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

FILE: [Redacted]
EAC 00 119 54241


Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: DEC 17 2001

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
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:



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
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 appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic 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 submit additional evidence as had been requested to establish that she: (1) has resided in the United States with the citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(D); (2) has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage; or is the parent of a child who has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(E); and (3) entered into the marriage to the citizen or lawful permanent resident in good faith pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(H). The director, therefore, denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel states that "this appeal is based on the preposterous initial request of the Service to prove the bona fides of the marriage." He asserts that the requested material was irrelevant to the allegation of abuse and to the I-360 petition. Counsel further states that he is sending a brief and/or evidence within 30 days; however, it has been approximately eight months since the filing of the appeal and neither a brief nor additional evidence has been received.

8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

Summary dismissal. An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Despite counsel's assertion, the record reflects that the director reviewed the record of proceeding, including evidence furnished in response to the director's request for additional evidence on April 5, 2000, and determined that the evidence of record was insufficient to establish that the petitioner qualifies for the benefit sought. The director noted that although the petitioner was requested in his notice of intent to deny the petition on

October 24, 2000, to submit additional evidence, she had failed to do so. Nor did the petitioner submit a brief and/or evidence within 30 days as stated on appeal. Furthermore, counsel failed to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. Accordingly, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.