






U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




Date: **OCT 27 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 Acting 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 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 denied the petition for failure to establish that the petitioner: (1) is eligible for immigrant classification based on a qualifying relationship with a U.S. citizen; (2) was subjected to battery or extreme cruelty during his marriage to a U.S. citizen; and (3) is a person of good moral character.

On the appeal notice, the petitioner, through counsel, briefly asserts that the director’s decision was “arbitrary and capricious” and an abuse of discretion. Counsel indicates that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted within 30 days of filing the appeal notice. The appeal notice was filed on September 17, 2013. As of the date of this decision, we have not received a brief or additional evidence to specifically address the director’s decision.

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 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); *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375 (AAO 2010). Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.