

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B9



FILE:

[Redacted]
EAC 05 049 51607

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: NOV 20 2007

IN RE:

Petitioner:



PETITION: Petition for Immigrant Abused 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.

Maura Deadrick
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks immigrant classification 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 an alien subjected to battery or extreme cruelty by her United States citizen spouse. The director denied the petition because the petitioner did not establish that her spouse subjected her to battery or extreme cruelty during their marriage.

On the Form I-290B, the petitioner asserts that the director denied unspecified “constitutional rights,” “failed to enter an order on the finding of facts” and made other unidentified “errors of law and facts” that the petitioner stated would “be cited and briefed along with other evidences within thirty days.” The petitioner dated the appeal July 5, 2007. To date, over four months later, the AAO has received nothing further from the petitioner.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) prescribes that an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. The petitioner has not specifically addressed the stated reasons for denial, has not identified specifically any error of law or fact in the director’s decision and has not provided any additional evidence. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.