



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



B9

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 27 2007
EAC 05 163 53116

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.

Maura Deadrick
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 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 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 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].

In this case, the director initially denied the petition on October 5, 2005 for failure to establish the requisite battery or extreme cruelty. In its July 13, 2006 decision on appeal, the AAO concurred with the director's determinations but remanded the petition for issuance of a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) in compliance with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(3)(ii). Upon remand, the director issued a NOID on August 21, 2006, which informed the petitioner that he had failed to establish the requisite battery or extreme cruelty. The petitioner did not respond to the NOID. Accordingly, the director denied the petition on January 18, 2007 on the ground cited in the NOID. In her Notice of Certification, the director informed the petitioner, through counsel, that he could submit a brief to the AAO within 30 days after service of the certified decision. To date, over 11 months later, the AAO has received nothing further from counsel or the petitioner.

The relevant evidence submitted below was discussed in our prior decision, incorporated here by reference. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) has received no further evidence or brief from counsel or the petitioner since that decision was issued. Accordingly, the January 18, 2007 decision of the director denying the petition is affirmed. The petitioner has not demonstrated that his former wife subjected him to battery or extreme cruelty during their marriage and he is consequently ineligible for immigrant classification under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act.

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. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The director's decision of January 18, 2007 is affirmed. The petition is denied.