



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)

Date: **SEP 03 2013**

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

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:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements.** See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

  
Ron Rosenberg  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Vermont Service Center, revoked approval of the immigrant visa petition after properly notifying the petitioner and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks immigrant classification under 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 revoked approval of the petition on the basis of his determination that the petitioner failed to establish that she entered into marriage with her spouse in good faith, they resided together, and he subjected her to battery or extreme cruelty.

On the appeal notice, counsel briefly asserts that the revocation was erroneous and capricious. Counsel, however, fails to specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law, or meaningfully address any of the director's grounds for denial of the petition. Counsel indicated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days of filing the appeal. The appeal was filed on February 22, 2013. As of the date of this decision, the AAO has not received a brief or any other additional evidence from the petitioner or counsel.

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. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v). As the petitioner has not identified any specific, erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in the director's decision, the appeal must be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.