

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: **JUL 02 2012** Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER FILE:

IN RE: Self- 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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630 or a request for a fee waiver. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to 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 dismissed as moot.

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 lacked good moral character due to her criminal convictions.

The appeal will be dismissed as moot because the petitioner remains an immigrant. The record shows that the petitioner was admitted to the United States on June 11, 1992 as a lawful permanent resident. Although the petitioner is currently in removal proceedings before the Orlando Immigration Court, she has not yet lost her lawful permanent resident status. Lawful permanent resident status terminates upon entry of a final administrative order of removal. 8 C.F.R. § 1.2. *See also Etuk v. Slattery*, 936 F.2d 1433, 1447 (2d Cir. 1991) (citing *Matter of Gunaydin*, 18 I&N Dec. 326 (BIA 1982)). Lawful permanent residency may also be lost through abandonment, rescission, or relinquishment. *See Matter of Gunaydin*, 18 I&N Dec. at 327 n.1. However, none of those circumstances exist in this matter. Consequently, the petitioner remains a lawful permanent resident and has already obtained the immigration benefit she seeks through the instant petition. The issues in this proceeding are thereby moot and the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed as moot.