



BA

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identification data deleted in
accordance with 8 CFR 101.11.1
b(1)(ii) and 8 CFR 101.11.1

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



FILE: [Redacted]
EAC 01 038 54271

Office: Vermont Service Center

Date:
09 MAY 2002

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.

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 rejected, and the case will be remanded for further action.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of Romania 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 evidence as had been requested to establish that she: (1) is a person of good moral character pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(F); and (2) 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 did furnish sufficient evidence to establish good moral character and good-faith marriage; however, the Service failed to consider the evidence furnished including the two affidavits submitted by friends who know of the relationship. Counsel resubmits the evidence.

Because the petitioner submitted insufficient evidence to establish that she has met the requirements of 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(F) and (H), she was requested on January 11, 2001, and again on April 3, 2001, to submit additional evidence. The director listed examples of evidence she may submit to establish eligibility. Because the petitioner failed to submit evidence as had been requested, the director denied the petition on September 28, 2001.

8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(13) provides that if all requested initial evidence is not submitted by the required date, the application or petition shall be considered abandoned and, accordingly, shall be denied. 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(15) provides that a denial due to abandonment may not be appealed, but an applicant or petitioner may file a motion to reopen under 8 C.F.R. 103.5.

An appeal was subsequently filed by the petitioner. However, there is no appeal of the director's decision in the present case. The appeal will, therefore, be rejected. The applicant, however, has submitted additional documents for the record. Therefore, the case will be remanded to the director so that he may reopen the matter on a Service motion, and adjudicate the petition supported by the documentation. The director shall enter a new decision which, if



adverse to the applicant, is to be certified to the Associate Commissioner, Examinations, for review.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The case is remanded for appropriate action consistent with the above discussion and entry of a new decision.