




BA

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data does
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal

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



25 JUL 2002

FILE: [Redacted]
EAC 01 034 50766

Office: Vermont Service Center


Date:

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:



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 St. Lucia 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 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. The director, therefore, denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner met his burden of proof with the documentation that was already provided. He submits additional evidence.

8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1) 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 record reflects that the petitioner entered the United States as a B-1 visitor for business on September 10, 1996. The petitioner married his United States citizen spouse on February 25, 1997 at Orlando, Florida. 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, his U.S. citizen spouse during their marriage.

8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(E) requires the petitioner to establish that he 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.

The qualifying abuse must have been sufficiently aggravated to have reached the level of "battery or extreme cruelty." 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(vi) provides:

[T]he phrase, "was battered by or was the subject of extreme cruelty" includes, but is not limited to, being the victim of any act or threatened act of violence, including any forceful detention, which results or threatens to result in physical or mental injury. Psychological or sexual abuse or exploitation, including rape, molestation, incest (if the victim is a minor), or forced prostitution shall be considered acts of violence. Other abusive actions may also be acts of violence under certain circumstances, including acts that, in and of themselves, may not initially appear violent but that are a part of an overall pattern of violence. The qualifying abuse must have been committed by the citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse, must have been perpetrated against the self-petitioner or the self-petitioner's child, and must have taken place during the self-petitioner's marriage to the abuser.

8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(2) provides, in part:

(i) Self-petitioners are encouraged to submit primary evidence whenever possible. The Service will consider,

however, any credible evidence relevant to the petition. The determination of what evidence is credible and the weight to be given that evidence shall be within the sole discretion of the Service.

*

*

*

(iv) Evidence of abuse may include, but is not limited to, reports and affidavits from police, judges and other court officials, medical personnel, school officials, clergy, social workers, and other social service agency personnel. Persons who have obtained an order of protection against the abuser or have taken other legal steps to end the abuse are strongly encouraged to submit copies of the relating legal documents. Evidence that the abuse victim sought safe-haven in a battered women's shelter or similar refuge may be relevant, as may a combination of documents such as a photograph of the visibly injured self-petitioner supported by affidavits. Other forms of credible relevant evidence will also be considered. Documentary proof of non-qualifying abuse may only be used to establish a pattern of abuse and violence and to support a claim that qualifying abuse also occurred.

The director, in his decision, reviewed and discussed the evidence furnished by the petitioner, including evidence furnished in response to his request for additional evidence. That discussion will not be repeated here. The director, however, noted that the petitioner furnished three separate documents from individuals providing reports on different analysis conducted, and all indicated that further counseling regarding the marriage and the abandonment would be helpful. He further noted that the circumstances described, including the petitioner's affidavit, appear to be directly related to the marriage's disintegration and that the petitioner and his wife were both aware of the petitioner's decision to depart from the marital home. The director added that VAWA was designed to aid those individuals who have suffered from physical abuse or extreme mental cruelty, and that the intent of Congress was not to include those parties suffering from mental anguish associated with a failing marriage.

Counsel, on appeal, now states that the petitioner's U.S. citizen spouse's behaviors and actions towards the petitioner did in fact reach a level that meets "extreme cruelty" as he was threatened by deportation, he was hit repeatedly, and he found the woman he loves in bed with another man. He claims that this information was not previously provided due to the cultural and personal make up of the applicant. Counsel submits an addendum to the petitioner's psychological evaluation signed by Mary E. Griffin and James P. Beller on March 8, 2002. Attached to the addendum are copies of

two hand-written, undated, and unsigned letters which appear to have been written by the petitioner. The evaluator indicates that the petitioner went into detail about the physical and psychological abuse he endured in his relationship with his spouse: (1) The petitioner states that on one occasion, "I was laying on the couch, and my wife came from nowhere and hit me on the back with a mop stick," she told him to hit her back, but "I knew she was just trying to get me arrested so that I would be deported;" (2) the petitioner recalls at least one other occasion that his spouse hit him in an attempt to bait him to hit back; (3) the petitioner ran home to pick up an insurance certificate and he discovered his wife naked in bed with another man, that she "got very angry at me like I had done something wrong....she told me to leave because it was her home....I picked up some clothes and left."

This claim, however, was not previously addressed by the petitioner and is inconsistent with statements previously made by the petitioner and his counselors and psychologists. An applicant raises questions of credibility when asserting a substantially revised claim to eligibility on appeal. Only after the petition was denied did the petitioner claim that he was threatened by deportation, he was hit repeatedly, and he found his spouse in bed with another man. The petitioner has submitted no documentary evidence in support of his new claim. The determination of what evidence is credible and the weight to be given that evidence shall be within the sole discretion of the Service. 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(2)(i).

As provided in 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(vi), the qualifying abuse must have been sufficiently aggravated to have reached the level of "battery or extreme cruelty." The petitioner has failed to establish that he was battered by or was the subject of "extreme cruelty" as contemplated by Congress, and to overcome the director's finding pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(E).

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. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.