

PUBLIC COPY

B9

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Citizenship and Immigration Services


Identifying data deleted to  
prevent identity theft and  
invasion of personal privacy

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE  
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F  
425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20536



FILE:  Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: JAN 05 2004

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)

ON 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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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.

*Cindy M. Gomeny*  
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 Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of Ecuador 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 Service (now CIS) erred in not approving the petition as the petitioner had established through documentary evidence that he was subjected to extreme cruelty. He further asserts that CIS's interpretation of what constitutes extreme mental cruelty is unjustifiable.

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 petition, Form I-360, shows that the petitioner arrived in the United States in May 1994. However, his current immigration status or how he entered the United States was not shown. The petitioner married his United States citizen spouse on April 17, 1996 at Bronx, New York. On December 5, 2001, 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.

To establish that he has met this requirement, the petitioner furnished with his Form I-360 self-petition a "Summary of Assessment" from Irene Torres, CSW. The director determined that this evidence was insufficient to establish the petitioner's claim that he was subjected to extreme mental cruelty. The applicant was, therefore, requested on March 27, 2002, to submit additional

evidence. The director listed examples of evidence the petitioner may submit to establish that he was subjected to extreme mental cruelty by his spouse. In response, the petitioner requested that CIS issue a decision based on the evidence presented.

The director determined that based on the submitted "Summary of Assessment," it cannot be concluded that the behavior of the petitioner's spouse, which also caused his emotional distress and disappointment, qualified as an act of extreme mental cruelty. He further determined that the behavior described in Ms. Torres' assessment appeared to be a normal reaction to a dysfunctional and ultimate deterioration of a marriage due to infidelities, financial distrust, incompatibilities and finally, abandonment. It does not, in and of itself, establish an abusive relationship due to extreme mental cruelty perpetrated by his spouse.

A self-petitioner who has suffered no physical abuse is not precluded from a finding of eligibility for the benefit sought. As defined in 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(vi), the 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.

While counsel, on appeal, asserts that the petitioner had established, through documentary evidence, that he was subjected to extreme cruelty, and that CIS' interpretation of what constitutes extreme mental cruelty is unjustifiable, the record reflects that the claim of qualifying abuse was evaluated by the director after a review of the evidence contained in the record of proceeding. He concluded that the record did not contain satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the petitioner had been battered by or had been the subject of extreme mental cruelty perpetrated by his spouse.

The evidence of abuse is based solely upon testimony offered by the petitioner and upon the version of events transmitted by the petitioner to Ms. Torres, and is not supported by any corroborating evidence to establish the claim of abuse. Although the director listed examples of evidence the petitioner may submit to establish that he was subjected to extreme mental cruelty, these were not submitted. Rather, the petitioner indicated that there was no further evidence to be submitted and that CIS issue a decision based on the "Summary of Assessment" from Ms. Torres. On appeal, no additional evidence was furnished to establish the

petitioner's claim that he was subjected to extreme mental cruelty.

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 record contains insufficient evidence to establish that the claimed abuse perpetrated toward the petitioner by his spouse was "extreme." 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 findings of the director 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.