


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

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



B9

JUN 04 2009

FILE:

EAC 06 260 50340

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date:


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.

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The director granted a subsequent motion to reopen and reaffirmed his decision to deny the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The decision of the director will be withdrawn and the petition will be remanded for further action.

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 United States citizen.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner did not establish that her husband subjected her to battery or extreme cruelty during their marriage.

On appeal, the petitioner requests oral argument, claiming that she was misrepresented by all of her attorneys. The petitioner submits a copy of an email between her and her current counsel, and an email from U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) pertaining to her status request of the instant petition.

The AAO acknowledges the petitioner's assertion that she was misrepresented by all of her attorneys. The Attorney General has recently issued a binding precedent superseding *Lozada: Matter of Compean, Bangaly and J-E-C-, et al.*, 24 I&N Dec. 710 (A.G. 2009). In *Compean*, the Attorney General held that the Constitution affords no right to counsel or effective assistance of counsel to aliens in immigration proceedings under the Sixth Amendment or the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. *Id.* at 711-27. Although the Act and regulations also do not afford aliens a right to effective assistance of counsel, USCIS may, in its discretion, reopen proceedings based on the deficient performance of an alien's prior attorney. *Id.* at 727. *Compean* establishes three elements of proof and six documentary requirements that an alien must meet to prevail on a claim of deficient performance of counsel. *Id.* Although *Compean* addresses deficient performance of counsel claims in the context of motions to reopen removal proceedings, the decision also applies to claims of deficient performance raised on direct review. *Id.* at 728 n.6.

To prevail on a deficient performance of counsel claim, the alien must show:

1) that counsel's failings were egregious; 2) in cases where the alien moves to reopen beyond the 30-day limit, the alien must show that he or she exercised due diligence in discovering and seeking to cure the lawyer's deficient performance; and 3) that the alien was prejudiced by the attorney's error(s). To establish prejudice, the alien must show that but for the deficient performance, it is more likely than not that the alien would have been entitled to the relief he or she was seeking.^[1] *Id.* at 732-34.

To establish these three requirements, the alien must submit six documents: 1) the alien's detailed

^[1] Where the alien sought discretionary relief, the alien must not only show that he or she was eligible for such relief, but also would have merited a favorable exercise of discretion. *Matter of Compean*, 24 I&N Dec. at 734-35.

affidavit setting forth the relevant facts and specifically stating what the lawyer did or did not do and why the alien was consequently harmed; 2) a copy of the agreement, if any, between the lawyer and the alien. If no written agreement exists, the alien must specify what the lawyer agreed to do in his or her affidavit; 3) a copy of the alien's letter to the attorney setting forth the attorney's deficient performance and a copy of the attorney's response, if any; 4) a completed and signed complaint addressed to the appropriate State bar or disciplinary authorities; 5) any document(s) the alien claims the attorney failed to submit; and 6) when the alien is subsequently represented, a signed statement from the new attorney attesting to the deficient performance of the prior attorney. *Id.* at 735-38. If any of the latter five documents are unavailable or missing, the alien must explain why the documents are unavailable or summarize the contents of any missing documents. *Id.* at 735.

The three substantive requirements must be met for all deficient performance claims filed before and after *Compean* was issued on January 7, 2009. *Id.* at 741. For claims pending prior to January 7, 2009, the alien is not required to meet the six new documentary requirements, but must still comply with the requirements set forth in *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I&N Dec. 637 (BIA 1988). *Lozada* required an alien to submit: 1) an affidavit attesting to the relevant facts, detailing the agreement that was entered into, what actions were supposed to be taken and what the attorney did or did not do; 2) evidence that former counsel was informed of the allegations, given an opportunity to respond and former counsel's response, if any; and 3) evidence that a complaint has been filed with the appropriate disciplinary authorities regarding such representation or an explanation of why such a complaint was not filed. *Id.* at 638-39. On appeal, the petitioner does not provide any documentary evidence listed above to satisfy her ineffective assistance of counsel claim. Accordingly, the petitioner's assertions in this regard have no merit.

The petitioner submits a timely appeal with no additional evidence pertaining to the director's finding and requests oral argument before the AAO. The regulations provide that the requesting party must explain in writing why oral argument is necessary. Furthermore, the AAO has the sole authority to grant or deny a request for oral argument and will grant argument only in cases involving unique factors or issues of law that cannot be adequately addressed in writing. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(b). In this instance, the petitioner has identified no unique factors or issues of law to be resolved. The written record of proceedings fully represents the facts and issues in this matter. Consequently, the request for oral argument is denied. The petitioner does not provide a reason for the appeal on the Form I-290B, a statement or brief which alleges any error of law or fact on the part of the director, or any other discussion regarding how the evidence submitted on appeal addresses the director's reasons for denying the petition.

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.

Although the petitioner has failed to specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the case will be remanded because the director denied the petition without first issuing a NOID. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(3)(ii) directs that USCIS must provide a self-petitioner with a NOID and an opportunity to present additional information and arguments before a final adverse decision is made. Accordingly, the case will be remanded for issuance of a NOID, which will give the petitioner a final opportunity to overcome the deficiencies of her case.

As always, the burden of proof in visa petition proceedings remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361.

ORDER: The director's decision is withdrawn. The petition is remanded to the director for further action in accordance with the foregoing and entry of a new decision that, if adverse to the petitioner, is to be certified to the AAO for review.