PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

B9

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] OFFICE: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER DATE: APR 09 2004
EAC 02 039 50150

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary: [redacted]

PETITION: 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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Mari Johnson

For Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center on February 28, 2003. The petitioner appealed the director's denial to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of Mexico 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 issued a request for additional evidence from the petitioner on July 26, 2002. The request for additional evidence was sent to the petitioner at the address listed on the Form I-360 application. The petitioner replied to the request for additional evidence with a request for additional time in which to respond. The director granted the petitioner an additional sixty days in which to respond on October 31, 2002. The director received nothing more from the petitioner; therefore, he denied the petition. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that staff at her agency misfiled the second request for evidence.

The regulation at 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.

As the director denied the petition due to abandonment, the decision was not properly appealed and must be rejected.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.