

**Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

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

**PUBLIC COPY**



B9

Date:

**MAR 12 2012**

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER File:




IN RE:



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 the \$630 fee. 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 (Form I-360) and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

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 her U.S. citizen spouse.

The director denied the petition on the basis of his determination that the petitioner had failed to establish that she married her U.S. citizen husband in good faith, as required by section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I)(aa) of the Act; and because she was subject to the bar on approval of petitions based on marriages entered into while the alien was in removal proceedings at section 204(g) of the Act. On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

#### *Relevant Law and Regulations*

Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act provides that an alien who is the spouse of a United States citizen may self-petition for immigrant classification if the alien demonstrates that he or she entered into the marriage with the United States citizen spouse in good faith and that during the marriage, the alien or a child of the alien was battered or subjected to extreme cruelty perpetrated by the alien's spouse. In addition, the alien must show that he or she is eligible to be classified as an immediate relative under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act, resided with the abusive spouse, and is a person of good moral character. Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II).

Section 204(a)(1)(J) of the Act further states, in pertinent part:

In acting on petitions filed under clause (iii) or (iv) of subparagraph (A) . . . or in making determinations under subparagraphs (C) and (D), the [Secretary of Homeland Security] shall consider any credible evidence relevant to the petition. The determination of what evidence is credible and the weight to be given that evidence shall be within the sole discretion of the [Secretary of Homeland Security].

The record in this case indicates that the petitioner was in removal proceedings at the time of her marriage. In such a situation, section 204(g) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(g), prescribes:

*Restriction on petitions based on marriages entered while in exclusion or deportation proceedings.* – Notwithstanding subsection (a), except as provided in section 245(e)(3), a petition may not be approved to grant an alien immediate relative status by reason of a marriage which was entered into during the period [in which administrative or judicial proceedings are pending regarding the alien's right to remain in the United States], until the alien has resided outside the United States for a 2-year period beginning after the date of the marriage.

The record does not indicate that the petitioner resided outside of the United States for two years after her marriage. Accordingly, section 204(g) of the Act bars approval of this petition unless the petitioner can establish eligibility for the bona fide marriage exemption at section 245(e) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(e), which states:

*Restriction on adjustment of status based on marriages entered while in admissibility or deportation proceedings; bona fide marriage exception. –*

- (1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), an alien who is seeking to receive an immigrant visa on the basis of a marriage which was entered into during the period described in paragraph (2) may not have the alien's status adjusted under subsection (a).
- (2) The period described in this paragraph is the period during which administrative or judicial proceedings are pending regarding the alien's right to be admitted or remain in the United States.
- (3) Paragraph(1) and section 204(g) shall not apply with respect to a marriage if the alien establishes by *clear and convincing evidence* to the satisfaction of the [Secretary of Homeland Security] that the marriage was entered into in good faith and in accordance with the laws of the place where the marriage took place and the marriage was not entered into for the purpose of procuring the alien's admission as an immigrant and no fee or other consideration was given (other than a fee or other consideration to an attorney for assistance in preparation of a lawful petition) for the filing of a petition under section 204(a) . . . with respect to the alien spouse or alien son or daughter. In accordance with the regulations, there shall be only one level of administrative appellate review for each alien under the previous sentence.

The eligibility requirements for immigrant classification as an abused spouse under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act are explained further at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(1), which states, in pertinent part, the following:

(iv) *Eligibility for immigrant classification.* A self-petitioner is required to comply with the provisions of . . . section 204(g) of the Act . . . .

\* \* \*

(ix) *Good faith marriage.* A spousal self-petition cannot be approved if the self-petitioner entered into the marriage to the abuser for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws. A self-petition will not be denied, however, solely because the spouses are not living together and the marriage is no longer viable.

The evidentiary guidelines for a self-petition under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act are further explicated in the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(2), which states, in pertinent part:

*Evidence for a spousal self-petition –*

(i) *General.* Self-petitioners are encouraged to submit primary evidence whenever possible. The Service will consider, however, any credible evidence relevant to the petition. The determination of what evidence is credible and the weight to be given that evidence shall be within the sole discretion of the Service.

\* \* \*

(vii) *Good faith marriage.* Evidence of good faith at the time of marriage may include, but is not limited to, proof that one spouse has been listed as the other's spouse on insurance policies, property leases, income tax forms, or bank accounts; and testimony or other evidence regarding courtship, wedding ceremony, shared residence and experiences. Other types of readily available evidence might include the birth certificates of children born to the abuser and the spouse; police, medical, or court documents providing information about the relationship; and affidavits of persons with personal knowledge of the relationship. All credible relevant evidence will be considered.

*Pertinent Facts and Procedural History*

The petitioner is a citizen of Haiti who entered the United States on September 24, 2001 as a nonimmigrant visitor. In 2004, the petitioner was placed in removal proceedings. The petitioner married a U.S. citizen on March 10, 2006 in Miami, Florida at which time she remained in removal proceedings. The petitioner filed the instant Form I-360 on May 5, 2009. The director subsequently issued a Request for Evidence (RFE) of, *inter alia*, the petitioner's good faith in marrying her spouse. The petitioner, through counsel, timely responded with additional evidence which the director found insufficient to establish the petitioner's eligibility. The director denied the petition and the petitioner timely appealed.

The AAO reviews these proceedings *de novo*. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). A full review of the record, including the evidence submitted on appeal, fails to establish the petitioner's eligibility. The petitioner's claims on appeal do not overcome the director's grounds for denial and the appeal will be dismissed for the following reasons.

*Entry into the Marriage in Good Faith*

The relevant evidence submitted below and counsel's brief on appeal fail to demonstrate the petitioner's entry into her marriage in good faith. The director properly reviewed and addressed the deficiencies of the relevant evidence of record below, including the affidavits of the petitioner and her friends. While counsel contends that the director failed to consider affidavits from five of the petitioner's friends and landlord, a review of the file reveals no prejudicial error. Affidavits provided by [REDACTED] only state that they knew of the marriage between the petitioner and her spouse, visited the petitioner and spouse's home, met with the petitioner and her spouse or were their landlord. Outside of brief statements in

regard to physical or verbal abuse observed by the affiants, none of these affidavits provide any further detail in regard to the petitioner's interactions with or feelings for her spouse during their courtship or marriage.

A full review of the relevant evidence submitted below and on appeal fails to reveal any error in the director's determination. The relevant documents show that the petitioner had a bank account on which her spouse was listed as a trustee at a time after the petitioner's spouse allegedly abandoned her and that the petitioner and her spouse rented an apartment together from February 2006 until April 2007. In her affidavits, the petitioner fails to provide a detailed, probative account of her and her husband's courtship, marriage, joint residence or any of their other shared experiences. None of the petitioner's friends discuss in probative detail their observations of the petitioner's interactions with or feelings for her spouse during their courtship or marriage or otherwise demonstrate their personal knowledge of the relationship. Accordingly, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that she entered into marriage with her spouse in good faith, as required by section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I)(aa) of the Act.

*Section 204(g) of the Act further Bars Approval*

Because the petitioner married her husband while she was in removal proceedings and did not remain outside of the United States for two years after their marriage, her self-petition cannot be approved pursuant to section 204(g) of the Act unless she establishes the bona fides of her marriage by clear and convincing evidence pursuant to section 245(e)(3) of the Act. While identical or similar evidence may be submitted to establish a good faith marriage pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I)(aa) of the Act and the bona fide marriage exception at section 245(e)(3) of the Act, the latter provision imposes a heightened burden of proof. *Matter of Arthur*, 20 I&N Dec. 475, 478 (BIA 1992). *See also Pritchett v. I.N.S.*, 993 F.2d 80, 85 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) (acknowledging "clear and convincing evidence" as an "exacting standard."). To demonstrate eligibility under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I)(aa) of the Act, the petitioner must establish his or her good-faith entry into the qualifying relationship by a preponderance of the evidence and any credible evidence shall be considered. Section 204(a)(1)(J) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(J); *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369 (AAO 2010). However, to be eligible for the bona fide marriage exemption under section 245(e)(3) of the Act, the petitioner must establish his or her good-faith entry into the marriage by clear and convincing evidence. Section 245(e)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(e)(3); 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(c)(9)(v). "Clear and convincing evidence" is a more stringent standard. *Arthur*, 20 I&N Dec. at 478.

As the petitioner failed to establish her good-faith entry into her marriage by a preponderance of the evidence under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I)(aa) of the Act, she also has not demonstrated the bona fides of her marriage under the heightened standard of proof required by section 245(e)(3) of the Act. Section 204(g) of the Act consequently bars approval of this petition.

*Eligibility for Immediate Relative Classification*

Because the petitioner is not exempt from section 204(g) of the Act, she has also failed to demonstrate her eligibility for immediate relative classification, as required by section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II)(cc) of the Act and as explicated in the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(1)(iv).

*Conclusion*

On appeal, the petitioner has failed to overcome the director's determination that she did not establish the requisite entry into the marriage in good faith and that she is exempt from the bar to approval of her petition under section 204(g) of the Act. She is consequently ineligible for immigrant classification under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act.

In these proceedings, the petitioner bears the burden of proof to establish her eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375 (AAO 2010). Here, that burden has not been met. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed and the petition will remain denied for the reasons stated above.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.