


(b)(6)


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




Date: **OCT 10 2014** 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 (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, (“the director”) denied the immigrant visa petition 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 his U.S. citizen spouse.

The director denied the petition based on his determination that the petitioner did not establish his good moral character after he failed to respond to a Request for Evidence (RFE).

On appeal, counsel submits additional evidence.

Applicable Law

Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I) 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 his marriage. In such a situation, section 204(g) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(g), prescribes, in pertinent part:

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 his 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.

(Emphasis added)

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

(v) *Residence.* . . . The self-petitioner is not required to be living with the abuser when the petition is filed, but he or she must have resided with the abuser . . . in the past.

* * *

(vii) *Good moral character.* A self-petitioner will be found to lack good moral character if he or she is a person described in section 101(f) of the Act. Extenuating circumstances may be taken into account if the person has not been convicted of an offense or offenses but admits to the commission of an act or acts that could show a lack of good moral character under section 101(f) of the Act. . . . A self-petitioner will also be found to lack good moral character, unless

he or she establishes extenuating circumstances, if he or she . . . committed unlawful acts that adversely reflect upon his or her moral character, or was convicted or imprisoned for such acts, although the acts do not require an automatic finding of lack of good moral character. A self-petitioner's claim of good moral character will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the provisions of section 101(f) of the Act and the standards of the average citizen in the community. If the results of record checks conducted prior to the issuance of an immigrant visa or approval of an application for adjustment of status disclose that the self-petitioner is no longer a person of good moral character or that he or she has not been a person of good moral character in the past, a pending self-petition will be denied or the approval of a self-petition will be revoked.

Section 101(f) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f), states, in pertinent part:

No person shall be regarded as, or found to be, a person of good moral character who, during the period for which good moral character is required to be established, is, or was –

* * *

(3) a member of one or more of the classes of persons, whether inadmissible or not, described in . . . subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 212(a)(2) [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)] and subparagraph (C) thereof of such section (except as such paragraph relates to simple possession of thirty grams or less of marijuana), if the offense described therein, for which such person was convicted or of which he admits the commission, was committed during such period...

* * *

The fact that any person is not within any of the foregoing classes shall not preclude a finding that for other reasons such person is or was not of good moral character. . . .

As referenced in section 101(f)(3) of the Act, section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Act, includes, "any alien convicted of. . . a violation of . . . any law or regulation of a State, the United States, or a foreign country relating to a controlled substance. . . ."

With reference to the good faith marriage requirement, 8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(1) states:

(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:

(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.

* * *

(iii) *Residence.* One or more documents may be submitted showing that the self-petitioner and the abuser have resided together Employment records, utility receipts, school records, hospital or medical records, birth certificates of children . . . , deeds, mortgages, rental records, insurance policies, affidavits or any other type of relevant credible evidence of residency may be submitted.

* * *

(v) *Good moral character.* Primary evidence of the self-petitioner's good moral character is the self-petitioner's affidavit. The affidavit should be accompanied by a local police clearance or a state-issued criminal background check from each locality or state in the United States in which the self-petitioner has resided for six or more months during the 3-year period immediately preceding the filing of the self-petition. . . . If police clearances, criminal background checks, or similar reports are not available for some or all locations, the self-petitioner may include an explanation and submit other evidence with his or her affidavit. The Service will consider other credible evidence of good moral character, such as affidavits from responsible persons who can knowledgeably attest to the self-petitioner's good moral character.

* * *

(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.

Facts and Procedural History

The petitioner is a citizen of Colombia who entered the United States on March 28, 1997, as B-2 nonimmigrant visitor. On July 16, 2009, the petitioner was issued a Notice to Appear in removal proceedings for remaining in the United States without authorization.¹ The petitioner married his wife, a U.S. citizen, on November [REDACTED] in Alabama. The petitioner filed the instant Form I-360 on December 19, 2011. The director subsequently issued a Request for Evidence (RFE) of, among other things, the petitioner's good moral character. The petitioner, through counsel, submitted a partial response and requested an additional 30 days to submit further evidence. Counsel submitted no additional evidence in the nearly four months before the director denied the petition. Counsel filed a timely appeal.

¹ On August 15, 2013, an Immigration Judge in the New York Immigration Court administratively closed, but did not terminate, the petitioner's removal proceedings. *See Matter of Bavakan Avetisyan*, 25 I&N Dec. 688, 695 (BIA 2012) (administrative closure does not result in a final order and is not equivalent to the termination of removal proceedings).

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 evidence submitted on appeal does not overcome the director's ground for denial and the appeal will be dismissed for the following reasons.

Good Moral Character

The record reflects that on or about May [REDACTED] the petitioner was convicted in the Alabama District Court of [REDACTED] of cocaine possession.² Prosecution of the petitioner's case was deferred prosecution pursuant to his guilty plea and ultimately withdrawn upon his completion of all the requirements imposed by the court, including a drug treatment program. The disposition of the petitioner's criminal offense constitutes a conviction under the Act. Section 101(a)(48)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(48)(A), defines "conviction" for immigration purposes as:

with respect to an alien, a formal judgment of guilt of the alien entered by a court or, if adjudication of guilt has been withheld, where –

- (i) a judge or jury has found the alien guilty or the alien has entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or has admitted sufficient facts to warrant a finding of guilt, and
- (ii) the judge has ordered some form of punishment, penalty, or restraint on the alien's liberty to be imposed.

Here, the petitioner waived a jury trial and entered a plea of guilty to Unlawful Possession of Cocaine, a Controlled Substance, and was ordered to pay Court costs and enroll in a drug treatment program. The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) has held that the imposition of costs and surcharges in a criminal sentence constitutes a form of penalty or punishment under section 101(a)(48)(A). *Matter of Cabrera*, 24 I. & N. Dec. 459 (BIA 2008). As such, both prongs of the definition of a conviction have been satisfied.

Section 101(f)(3) of the Act bars a finding of good moral character for any alien described in 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Act, for having been convicted of a controlled substance offense. The petitioner was convicted of possession of cocaine, a controlled substance, and section 101(f)(3) of the Act consequently prohibits a determination that he is a person of good moral character.

On appeal, the petitioner submits his criminal records and three affidavits from friends attesting to his good moral character. A self-petitioner may only be found to have good moral character despite an act or conviction that would otherwise bar such a finding under section 101(f) of the Act if: 1) the alien's act or conviction is waivable for the purposes of determining admissibility or deportability under section 212(a) or section 237(a) of the Act; and 2) United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) determines that the act or conviction was connected to the alien's having been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty. Section 204(a)(1)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(C).

² Alabama District Court of [REDACTED] Case number [REDACTED]

The petitioner's crime is not waivable under section 212(h) of the Act, as it involved cocaine possession, not marijuana, and the petitioner has not provided any evidence that the conviction was connected to having been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty. As such, the present record fails to establish the petitioner's good moral character, as required by section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II)(bb) of the Act.

Entry into the Marriage in Good Faith and Joint Residence

Beyond the director's decision,³ the petitioner has failed to demonstrate his entry into his marriage in good faith and that he resided with his wife. In his affidavit, the petitioner focused on the abuse in the marriage and did not probatively describe any residence he shared with his wife, how they met, their courtship, wedding ceremony or any of their shared experiences, apart from the abuse.

The petitioner submitted two joint checking account statements for the period of October to December 2010, after the petitioner stated that he and his wife had separated. He also submitted one mortgage statement addressed to his wife individually and listing a property address different than his claimed marital residence. While the record contains copies of 2009 federal and state income tax returns for the petitioner and his wife marked as "married filing jointly," the petitioner submitted no evidence that the returns were actually filed. Even regardless of these documentary deficiencies, the petitioner has provided no statements describing his shared residence with his wife, how they met, their courtship, shared experiences (apart from the abuse) or any other information regarding his marital intentions. The petitioner has not established by a preponderance of the evidence, that he resided with his wife and that he entered their marriage in good faith, as required by section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I)(aa) and (II)(dd) of the Act of the Act.

Section 204(g) of the Act further Bars Approval

Beyond the decision of the director, section 204(g) of the Act bars approval of this petition. Because the petitioner married his wife while he was in removal proceedings and did not remain outside of the United States for two years after their marriage, his self-petition cannot be approved pursuant to section 204(g) of the Act unless he establishes the bona fides of his 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 (5th 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 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

³ An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. See *Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003).

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 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 his good-faith entry into his marriage by a preponderance of the evidence under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I)(aa) of the Act, he also has not demonstrated the bona fides of his 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.

Conclusion

On appeal, the petitioner has not demonstrated his good moral character. Beyond the director’s decision, he also failed to establish that he entered into marriage with his wife in good faith and resided with her, and that he is exempt from the bar to approval of his petition under section 204(g) of the Act. He is consequently ineligible for immigrant classification under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Act.

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 dismissed.