

identifying data deleted to
prevent disclosure of warrant
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B9
JUN 13 2005



FILE: [REDACTED]
EAC 03 228 54120

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date:

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
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:



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.

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 summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of Canada 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 denied the petition, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that he has a qualifying marriage with a United States citizen, that he has been battered or the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by his U.S. citizen spouse, and that he is a person of good moral character.

The petitioner, through counsel, files a timely appeal.

Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that an alien who is the spouse of a United States citizen, who is a person of good moral character, who is eligible to be classified as an immediate relative, and who has resided with his or her spouse, may self-petition for immigrant classification if the alien demonstrates to the Attorney General that—

(aa) the marriage or the intent to marry the United States citizen was entered into in good faith by the alien; and

(bb) during the marriage or relationship intended by the alien to be legally a marriage, the alien or a child of the alien has been battered or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by the alien's spouse or intended spouse.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(1)(i) states, in pertinent part, that:

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; [and]

* * *

(H) Entered into the marriage to the citizen or lawful permanent resident in good faith.

The regulation at 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.

Because the petitioner furnished insufficient evidence to establish that he had been abused or subjected to extreme cruelty, that he is a person of good moral character, and that he is married to a United States citizen, the director requested the petitioner to submit additional evidence on June 30, 2004. The director listed evidence the petitioner could submit to establish battery or extreme mental cruelty and good moral character. The director also specifically requested a copy of the petitioner's marriage certificate and evidence of his spouse's United States citizenship.

On September 16, 2004, the petitioner, through counsel, responded to the director's request for evidence by submitting a copy of the petitioner's marriage certificate and requesting an additional 60 days in which to gather evidence. The director granted the request for an extension on October 12, 2004. No further evidence was received and the director denied the petition on January 27, 2005.

On appeal, counsel indicates that she would be sending a brief to the AAO within 30 days. To date, more than 60 days after the appeal was filed, no further evidence has been submitted. The record, therefore, is considered complete as it now stands. Counsel states the following as the reason for the appeal:

Director ignore [sic] critical and material evidence in file. [Petitioner] in appeal will show that he is eligible for benefits.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

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.

Counsel does not elaborate on her statement or point to specific evidence to support her assertion that the director ignored critical and material evidence. The statements of counsel on appeal or in a motion are not evidence and thus are not entitled to any evidentiary weight. See *INS v. Phinpathya*, 464 U.S. 183, 188-89 n.6 (1984); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1980). Moreover, counsel fails to specifically identify which evidence was purportedly ignored. Counsel's general statement is not sufficient to meet the requirement of the regulation.

Moreover, the regulation states that the petitioner shall submit additional evidence as the director, in his or her discretion, may deem necessary. The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8) and (12). The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

Where, as here, a petitioner has been put on notice of a deficiency in the evidence and has been given an opportunity to respond to that deficiency, the AAO will not accept evidence offered for the first time on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *see also Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). If the petitioner had wanted the submitted evidence to be considered, he should have submitted the documents in response to the director's request for evidence. *Id.* Accordingly, even if the petitioner has submitted additional documents as indicated, under the circumstances, the AAO would not consider the sufficiency of the evidence submitted on appeal.

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. Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.