


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: Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

File

IN RE: **FEB 13 2012** 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:

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, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed. The petition will remain denied.

The petitioner seeks immigrant 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.

The director denied the petition, after determining that the petitioner had not established that she had entered into the marriage in good faith.

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.

Counsel for the petitioner timely submits a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, checking the box on the Form I-290B indicating that a brief and/or additional evidence is attached. Counsel attaches the petitioner’s undated statement in which the petitioner states that she loved the claimed abusive United States citizen spouse. Counsel reminds the AAO of the “any credible evidence” standard for a Form I-360, Petition for Amerasian, Widow(er) or Special Immigrant (VAWA petition) and asserts that the previous documentation submitted satisfied the “any credible evidence” standard.

The director in this matter set out the deficiencies in the evidence the petitioner previously submitted in support of her claim that she entered into the marriage in good faith. Although counsel references the “any credible evidence” standard,¹ counsel does not identify specifically

¹ Section 204(a)(1)(J) of the Act requires United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to “consider any credible evidence relevant to the petition.” Section 204(a)(1)(J) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(J). This mandate is reiterated in the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(2)(i). However, this mandate establishes an evidentiary standard, not a burden of proof. Accordingly, “[t]he determination of what evidence is credible and the weight to be given that evidence shall be within the sole discretion of [USCIS].” Section 204(a)(1)(J) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(J); 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(2)(i). The evidentiary guidelines for demonstrating the requisite good faith lists examples of the types of documents that may be submitted and states, “All credible relevant evidence will be considered.” 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(2)(vii). In this matter, as in all visa petition proceedings, the petitioner bears the burden of proof to establish eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Soo Hoo*, 11 I&N Dec. 151 (BIA 1965). The mere submission of relevant evidence of the types listed in the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(2) will not necessarily meet the petitioner’s burden of proof. While USCIS must consider all credible evidence relevant to a petitioner’s claim of good faith intent, the agency is not obligated to determine that all such evidence is credible or sufficient to meet the petitioner’s burden of proof. Section 204(a)(1)(J) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(J); 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(2)(i). To require otherwise would

any erroneous conclusion or statement of fact in this proceeding. We concur with the director's assessment of the relevant evidence. Neither counsel nor the petitioner addresses the deficiencies in the evidence noted by the director. The record on appeal does not provide any further evidence establishing that the petitioner's entry into the marriage was in good faith. The record on appeal does not include any argument that overcomes the director's determination. 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 petition remains denied.

render the adjudicatory process meaningless.