



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]

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

FILE: [Redacted]
EAC 00 242 50293

Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: DEC 19 2001

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:
[Redacted]

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 dismissed.

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

The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish eligibility for the benefit sought because she was divorced from her allegedly abusive lawful permanent resident spouse prior to the filing of the self-petition. The director, therefore, denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel asserts that: (1) the Service can waive the time limit for filing; (2) the petitioner's extraordinary circumstances permit equitable tolling so that the late filing is acceptable; (3) the rule in using the present tense interpretation of the legislative meaning subverts the purpose of the law; and (4) the rule violates equal protection of the law.

There is no provision in the statute that permits the Service to waive the time limit for filing or permit the late filing of a Form I-360 self-petition. Furthermore, it should be initially noted that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (the Service) cannot pass judgement upon the constitutionality of the statute it administers. Counsel's contention, therefore, that a pertinent section of the Crime Bill as well as its implementing regulations violate both the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the Constitution is simply advanced in an inappropriate forum. The Service can address questions relating to the constitutionality of its application of the law; however, since all applicants seeking special immigrant status under the battered spouse provisions of the Act must qualify on the same basis, as mandated by Congress, no violation of equal protection can be found.

8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1), in effect at the time the self-petition was filed, states, in pertinent part, that:

(i) A spouse may file a self-petition under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) or 204(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act for his or her classification as an immigrant relative or as a preference immigrant if he or she:

(A) Is the spouse of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States;

(B) Is eligible for immigrant classification

under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) or 203(a)(2)(A) of the Act based on that relationship;

(C) Is residing in the United States;

(D) Has resided in the United States with the citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse;

(E) 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;

(F) Is a person of good moral character;

(G) Is a person whose deportation (removal) would result in extreme hardship to himself, herself, or his or her child; and

(H) Entered into the marriage to the citizen or lawful permanent resident in good faith.

The petition, Form I-360, shows that the petitioner arrived in the United States in November 1990. However, her current immigration status or how she entered the United States was not shown. The petitioner married her lawful permanent resident spouse on July 2, 1991 at Santa Maria, California. The petitioner subsequently petitioned for dissolution of the marriage, and the judgment of divorce became effective on November 29, 1994. On July 25, 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 lawful permanent resident spouse during their marriage.

8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(ii) states, in pertinent part:

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. After the self-petition has been properly filed, the legal termination of the marriage will have no effect on the decision made on the self-petition.

The petitioner furnished with her self-petition a copy of a final judgment for dissolution of marriage entered by the court on

November 29, 1994. The director, therefore, determined that the petitioner failed to establish eligibility for the benefit sought because she was divorced from her permanent resident spouse prior to the filing of the self-petition.

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(c) amends section 204(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act so that an alien self-petitioner claiming to qualify for immigration as the battered spouse or child of a lawful permanent resident 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 permanent resident spouse. Id. Section 1503(c), 114 Stat. at 1520-21.

The record, however, reflects that the petitioner and her permanent resident spouse divorced on November 29, 1994, and the self-petition was filed on July 25, 2000, more than two years after her divorce was final. The petitioner, therefore, does not qualify under this new amendment, and is ineligible for the benefit sought.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.