

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

Bo9

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **AUG 04 2008**

EAC 05 181 52292

IN RE:

Petitioner:

[REDACTED]

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:

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.

Maig Jensen

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. On appeal, the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) remanded the matter for further action. The matter is now before the AAO upon certification of the director's subsequent, adverse decision. The decision of the director will be affirmed and the petition will be denied.

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 battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by a United States citizen.

Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act provides that an alien who is the spouse of a United States citizen may self-petition for immigrant classification if the alien demonstrates that he or she entered into the marriage with the United States citizen spouse in good faith and that during the marriage, the alien or a child of the alien was battered or subjected to extreme cruelty perpetrated by the alien's spouse. In addition, the alien must show that he or she is eligible to be classified as an immediate relative under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act, resided with the abusive spouse, and is a person of good moral character. Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II).

Section 204(a)(1)(J) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(J) states, in pertinent part:

In acting on petitions filed under clause (iii) or (iv) of subparagraph (A) or clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (B), or in making determinations under subparagraphs (C) and (D), the [Secretary of Homeland Security] shall consider 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 [Secretary of Homeland Security].

As the facts and procedural history have been adequately documented in the previous decision of the AAO, we will only repeat certain facts as necessary here. In this case, the director initially denied the petition on January 9, 2006, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that he had a qualifying relationship as the spouse of a United States citizen, that he was eligible for immigrant classification based upon that relationship, and that he was battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by his citizen spouse. In the AAO's January 9, 2007 decision on appeal, the AAO concurred with the director's determination but remanded the petition for issuance of a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), as required by the regulation then in effect at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(3)(ii)(2007).¹ Upon remand, the director issued a NOID on April 17, 2007, which informed the petitioner of the deficiencies in the record and afforded him the opportunity to submit further evidence to establish the requisite qualifying relationship, eligibility for immigrant classification and abuse. The petitioner failed to respond to the NOID and the director denied the petition on September 7, 2007, based on the grounds cited in the NOID. The director certified his decision to the AAO for review and notified

¹ On April 17, 2007, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) promulgated a rule related to the issuance of requests for evidence and NOIDs. 72 Fed. Reg. 19100 (Apr. 17, 2007). The rule became effective on June 18, 2007, after all actions in this case except the certified decision.

the petitioner that he could submit a brief to the AAO within 30 days of service of the director's decision. To date, no further submission has been received. Accordingly, the record is considered to be complete as it now stands.

Upon review, we concur with the director's determination. The relevant evidence submitted below was discussed in the previous decision of the AAO, which is incorporated here by reference. The petitioner has submitted no further evidence since the issuance of that decision. Consequently, the petitioner is ineligible for immigrant classification under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act and his petition must be denied.

The petition will be denied for the reasons stated above, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met. Accordingly, the September 7, 2007 decision of the director is affirmed and the petition is denied.

ORDER: The director's decision of September 7, 2007 is affirmed. The petition is denied.