



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

B9



FILE:


EAC 08 076 50447

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JUL 08 2009

IN RE:



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.

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the immigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks immigrant classification under 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 citizen of the United States.

The director denied the petition on the basis of his determination that, because she and her husband had been divorced for longer than two years at the time she filed her petition, the petitioner had failed to establish that she has a qualifying relationship with a United States citizen, or that she is eligible for preference immigrant status on the basis of such a relationship. The director also found that the petitioner had failed to establish that she had shared a joint residence with her husband, or that she is a person of good moral character.

Counsel filed a timely appeal on March 23, 2009.

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)(A)(ii)(II)(aa) of the Act states, in pertinent part, that an individual who is no longer married to a citizen of the United States is eligible to self-petition under these provisions if he or she is an alien:

- (CC) who was a bona fide spouse of a United States citizen within the past 2 years and –
 - (aaa) whose spouse lost status within the past 2 years due to an incident of domestic violence
 - (bbb) whose spouse lost or renounced citizenship status within the past 2 years related to an incident of domestic violence; or
 - (ccc) who demonstrates a connection between the legal termination of the marriage within the past 2 years and battering or extreme cruelty by the United States citizen spouse. . . .

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 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].

The eligibility requirements are explained further at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(1), which states, in pertinent part, the following:

- (i) *Basic eligibility requirements.* A spouse may file a self-petition under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) . . . of the Act for his or her classification as an immediate relative . . . if he or she:

* * *

- (B) Is eligible for immigrant classification under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) . . . of the Act based on that relationship [to the U.S. citizen spouse].

* * *

- (v) *Residence.* . . . The self-petitioner is not required to be living with the abuser when the petition is filed, but he or she must have resided with the abuser in the United States in the past.

* * *

- (vii) *Good moral character.* A self-petitioner will be found to lack good moral character if he or she is a person described in section 101(f) of the Act. Extenuating circumstances may be taken into account if the person has not been convicted of an offense or offenses but admits to the commission of an act or acts that could show a lack of good moral character under section 101(f) of the Act. A person who was subjected to abuse in the form of forced prostitution or who can establish that he or she was forced to engage in other behavior that could render the person excludable under section 212(a) of the Act would not be precluded from being found to be a person of good moral character, provided the person has not been convicted for the commission of the offense or offenses in a court of law. A self-petitioner will also be found to lack good moral character, unless he or she establishes extenuating circumstances, if he or she willfully failed or refused to support dependents; or committed unlawful acts that adversely reflect upon his or her moral character, or was convicted or imprisoned for such acts, although the acts do not require an automatic finding of lack of good moral character. A

self-petitioner's claim of good moral character will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the provisions of section 101(f) of the Act and the standards of the average citizen in the community. If the results of record checks conducted prior to the issuance of an immigrant visa or approval of an application for adjustment of status disclose that the self-petitioner is no longer a person of good moral character or that he or she has not been a person of good moral character in the past, a pending self-petition will be denied or the approval of a self-petition will be revoked.

The evidentiary guidelines for a self-petition filed under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act are explained further at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(2), which states, in pertinent part, the following:

Evidence for a spousal self-petition –

- (i) *General.* Self-petitioners are encouraged to submit primary evidence whenever possible. The Service will consider, however, 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 Service.
- (ii) *Relationship.* A self-petition file by a spouse must be accompanied by evidence of ... the relationship. Primary evidence of a marital relationship is a marriage certificate issued by civil authorities. . . .

* * *

- (iii) *Residence.* One or more documents may be submitted showing that the self-petitioner and the abuser have resided together . . . Employment records, utility receipts, school records, hospital or medical records, birth certificates of children . . . , deeds, mortgages, rental records, insurance policies, affidavits or any other type of relevant credible evidence of residency may be submitted.

* * *

- (v) *Good moral character.* Primary evidence of the self-petitioner's good moral character is the self-petitioner's affidavit. The affidavit should be accompanied by a local police clearance or a state-issued criminal background check from each locality or state in the United States in which the self-petitioner has resided for six or more months during the 3-year period immediately preceding the filing of the self-petition. Self-petitioners who lived outside the United States during this time should submit a police clearance, criminal background check, or similar report issued by the

appropriate authority in each foreign country in which he or she resided for six or more months during the 3-year period immediately preceding the filing of the self-petition. If police clearances, criminal background checks, or similar reports are not available for some or all locations, the self-petitioner may include an explanation and submit other evidence with his or her affidavit. The Service will consider other credible evidence of good moral character, such as affidavits from responsible persons who can knowledgeably attest to the self-petitioner's good moral character.

The petitioner is a citizen of Mexico who entered the United States, without inspection, on or around July 5, 1996. She married J-G-,¹ a citizen of the United States, on December 28, 2001. They divorced on June 27, 2005.

The petitioner filed the instant Form I-360 on January 14, 2008. The director denied the petition on February 19, 2009.

Qualifying Relationship and Eligibility for Classification as an Immediate Relative

The petitioner concedes that she and J-G- divorced more than two years before she filed the instant petition. On appeal, she states that she filed for divorce from her husband in 2004, but that she fled from Texas to Georgia when her husband was released from jail on bond, as she feared for her life. She states that, since she never heard from her attorney after she filed for the divorce, "it was reasonable to believe that my case had been dismissed, because I never went to court." She states that the lawyer may not have contacted her because he did not have her contact information in Georgia, but that he should have at least sent some sort of notice to her mother's home in Houston, Texas, which had been her last known address. In any event, she did not learn that the divorce had been granted until 2007, when she again filed a second divorce petition.

The petitioner's statements on appeal do not overcome the basis of the director's decision with regard to the existence of a qualifying relationship. Although not specifically stated as such, she is, in essence, arguing that the doctrine of equitable tolling should be applied to this case. She is arguing that the statutory limitation contained in section 204(a) of the Act as it relates to the petitioners who are no longer married at the time of the filing of the Form I-360 should be tolled due to the equities involved in her case.

The equitable tolling doctrine is presumed to apply to every federal statute of limitation. *Holmberg v. Armbrecht*, 327 U.S. 392, 397 (1946); *Socop-Gonzalez v. I.N.S.*, 272 F.3d 1176, 1188 (9th Cir. 2001). However, not every statutory time limit is a statute of limitations subject to equitable tolling. A crucial distinction exists between statutes of limitation and statutes of repose. *Munoz v. Ashcroft*, 339 F.3d 950, 957 (9th Cir. 2003). A statute of limitations limits the time in which a plaintiff may bring suit after a cause of action accrues. A statute of repose, in contrast, "cuts off a cause of action

¹ Name withheld to protect individual's identity.

at a certain time irrespective of the time of accrual of the cause of action.” *Weddel v. Sec’y of H.H.S.*, 100 F.3d 929, 931 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Statutes of repose are not subject to equitable tolling. *Lampf Pleva, Lipkin, Prupis & Petigrow v. Gilbertson*, 501 U.S. 350, 363 (1991) (superseded on other grounds); *Weddel v. Sec’y of H.H.S.*, 100 F.3d at 930-32.

For example, several federal circuits have held that the 90 and 180 day filing deadlines for motions to reopen removal (or deportation) proceedings are statutes of limitation subject to equitable tolling. *See Socop-Gonzalez*, 272 F.3d at 1187-90; *Iavorski v. I.N.S.*, 232 F.3d 124, 134 (2nd Cir. 2000); *Riley v. I.N.S.*, 310 F.3d 1253, 1257 (10th Cir. 2002); *Borges v. Gonzalez*, 402 F.3d 398, 406 (3d Cir. 2005); *Pervais v. Gonzalez*, 405 F.3d 488, 490 (7th Cir. 2005). Yet, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals has held that the filing deadlines for motions to reopen deportation and removal proceedings are mandatory and jurisdictional and consequently not subject to equitable tolling. *Abdi v. U.S. Atty Gen.*, 430 F.3d 1148, 1150 (11th Cir. 2005); *Anin v. Reno*, 188 F.3d 1273, 1278 (11th Cir. 1999). In addition, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has held that the filing deadline for special rule cancellation under the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief (NACARA) is a statute of repose not subject to equitable tolling, *Munoz v. Ashcroft*, 339 F.3d at 957, but has held that the time limit for filing motions to reopen under NACARA is a statute of limitations subject to equitable tolling, *Albillo-DeLeon v. Gonzalez*, 410 F.3d 1090, 1098 (9th Cir. 2005).

The petitioner provides no basis upon which to conclude that the two-year, post-legal termination filing period of section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II)(aa)(CC)(ccc) of the Act is a statute of limitations subject to equitable tolling (and not a statute of repose not subject to equitable tolling), and presents no argument as to why this portion of the Act is comparable to other immigration statutes that federal circuit courts have found subject to equitable tolling.

The petitioner has failed to establish that this section of the Act is a statute of limitations subject to equitable tolling. Accordingly, the AAO concurs with the director’s finding that the petitioner has failed to establish a qualifying relationship, as required by section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II)(aa)(CC) of the Act. The director, therefore, properly denied the petition on this ground.

Joint Residence

The second issue on appeal is whether the petitioner has established that she and J-G- shared a joint residence. The AAO disagrees with the director’s analysis on this matter. The AAO finds the petitioner’s testimony reasonable, and finds no reason to doubt her veracity. The petitioner has established by a preponderance of the evidence that she shared a joint residence with J-G-, as required by section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II)(dd) of the Act.

Good Moral Character

The third issue on appeal is whether the petitioner has established that she is a person of good moral character. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(2)(v) states that primary evidence of a petitioner’s

good moral character is an affidavit from the petitioner, accompanied by local police clearances or state-issued criminal background checks from each place the petitioner has lived for at least six months during the three-year period immediately preceding the filing of the self-petition (in this case, during the period beginning in January 2005 and ending in January 2008).

In his February 19, 2009 denial, the director stated that although the record contained evidence from the State of Texas regarding the petitioner's good moral character, she had submitted no such evidence from the State of Georgia. As the petitioner has failed to correct this deficiency on appeal, she has failed to overcome this ground of the director's denial. She has failed to establish that she is a person of good moral character, as required by section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II)(bb) of the Act.

Conclusion

The AAO concurs with the director's determination that the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that she has a qualifying relationship with a citizen of the United States; that she is eligible for preference immigrant status on the basis of such a relationship; or that she is a person of good moral character. The petitioner, therefore, is ineligible for immigrant classification pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii), and the petition must be denied.

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 sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.