


**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals, MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



B9


FILE: [Redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER
EAC 08 006 50684

Date: **FEB 03 2010**

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:



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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The director denied the petition on April 6, 2009, determining that the petitioner had not established that she had resided with her United States citizen spouse and that she had not established that she entered into the marriage in good faith.

The petitioner timely submits a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal. The petitioner’s statement on the Form I-290B reads:

Vermont Service Center erroneously denied the I-360 petition I filed. I established all of the eligibility requirements in a satisfactory manner.

A detailed statement and additional evidence will be sent to the AAO.

The record does not contain further information or evidence submitted on appeal. Thus, the record is considered complete.

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.”

The petitioner does not provide evidence or argument in support of her assertion. The director articulated reasons why the petitioner had not established that she had resided with her United States citizen spouse and why the petitioner had not established that she had entered into the marriage in good faith. The petitioner in this matter does not identify specifically any erroneous conclusions of law or statements of fact made by the director as a basis for the appeal. The AAO, thus, is without further evidence or argument to evaluate regarding the petitioner’s failure to establish essential elements of eligibility for this benefit. The petitioner’s failure to specifically address the director’s findings and present evidence and argument identifying the director’s erroneous conclusions of law or statements of

fact mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

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.

The petition will be denied for the stated reasons set out in the director's decision, 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.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.