




B9
PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

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



FILE: [Redacted]
EAC 01 169 52724

Office: Vermont Service Center


Date: DEC 13 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision 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.

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 that 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 that 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 appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of Indonesia 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 he: (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); (3) is a person of good moral character pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(F); and (4) 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 asserts that the petitioner speaks limited English, and when he was posed a question concerning whether his marriage was consummated, he did not understand the term, consummated, therefore, he answered in the negative. While counsel states that she will prepare and submit a brief, it has been more than six months since the filing of the appeal in this matter, and neither a brief nor additional evidence has been received in the record of proceeding.

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.

The record reflects that the director reviewed the evidence of record and determined that the evidence furnished was insufficient to establish that the petitioner qualifies for the benefit sought.

The petitioner, on appeal, has 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 dismissed.