

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services


B9



DATE:

MAY 02 2011

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

File: 


IN RE:

Petitioner: 

PETITION: Petition for Immigrant Abused Spouse Pursuant to Section 204(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(B)(ii)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, initially approved the immigrant visa petition, but upon review revoked approval of the petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed. The approval of the petition remains revoked.

The petitioner seeks immigrant classification pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“the Act”), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(B)(ii), as an alien battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by a United States lawful permanent resident.

The director revoked approval of the petition, after determining that the petitioner had not established that she had a qualifying relationship with a United States lawful permanent resident when the petition was filed and thus was not statutorily eligible for immigrant classification pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act.

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 submits a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, checking the box on the Form I-290B indicating that a supplemental brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO in 30 days; however, no additional evidence has been received into the record. The petitioner states on the Form I-290B that the officer made a mistake in denying the case. The record is considered complete.

We find no error in the director’s decision. The petitioner does not provide any further evidence or argument on appeal that overcomes the director’s decision. The petitioner fails to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding. Accordingly, the appeal must be summarily dismissed pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

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. The approval of the petition remains revoked.