

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**

Bq.



**APR 30 2010**

FILE: [Redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER  
EAC 08 130 50623

Date:

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.

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 and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks 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 spouse.

The director denied the petition on May 14, 2009, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that she had the requisite qualifying relationship within two years of filing the petition. The petitioner filed a timely appeal on June 12, 2009.

On the I-290B, signed by the petitioner on June 9, 2009, the petitioner checked the block indicating that she would submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days. No further documents, however, have been received by the AAO to date. The record therefore is considered complete.

Although the petitioner disagrees with the director's decision, she 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.

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.