


(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: NOV 04 2013

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 


IN RE:

PETITIONER: 

PETITION:

Petition for U Nonimmigrant Classification as a Victim of a Qualifying Crime Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(U)

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

fn

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Vermont Service Center (the director), denied the U nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks nonimmigrant classification under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(U), as an alien victim of certain qualifying criminal activity.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner did not establish that she was the victim of qualifying criminal activity and she consequently did not meet any of the requirements for U nonimmigrant classification at section 101(a)(15)(U)(i) of the Act. On appeal, counsel submits a brief and copies of documents already included in the record.

*Applicable Law*

Section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Act, provides, in pertinent part, for U nonimmigrant classification to:

(i) subject to section 214(p), an alien who files a petition for status under this subparagraph, if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that --

- (I) the alien has suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of having been a victim of criminal activity described in clause (iii);
- (II) the alien . . . possesses information concerning criminal activity described in clause (iii);
- (III) the alien . . . has been helpful, is being helpful, or is likely to be helpful to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement official, to a Federal, State, or local prosecutor, to a Federal or State judge, to the Service, or to other Federal, State, or local authorities investigating or prosecuting criminal activity described in clause (iii); and
- (IV) the criminal activity described in clause (iii) violated the laws of the United States or occurred in the United States (including in Indian country and military installations) or the territories and possessions of the United States;

\*\*\*

(iii) the criminal activity referred to in this clause is that involving one or more of the following or any similar activity in violation of Federal, State, or local criminal law: rape; torture; trafficking; incest; domestic violence; sexual assault; abusive sexual contact; prostitution; sexual exploitation; stalking; female genital mutilation; being held hostage; peonage; involuntary servitude; slave trade; kidnapping; abduction; unlawful criminal restraint; false imprisonment; blackmail; extortion; manslaughter; murder; felonious assault; witness tampering; obstruction of justice; perjury; fraud in foreign labor contracting (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 1351); or attempt, conspiracy, or solicitation to commit any of the above mentioned crimes[.]<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The crimes of stalking and fraud in labor contracting as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 1351 were not listed as qualifying criminal activities when the petitioner filed the instant Form I-918 U petition. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013,

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.14(a) provides the following pertinent definition:

(14) *Victim of qualifying criminal activity* generally means an alien who has suffered direct and proximate harm as a result of the commission of qualifying criminal activity.

The eligibility requirements for U nonimmigrant classification are further explicated in the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.14, which states, in pertinent part:

(b) *Eligibility*. An alien is eligible for U-1 nonimmigrant status if he or she demonstrates all of the following . . . :

(1) The alien has suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of having been a victim of qualifying criminal activity. Whether abuse is substantial is based on a number of factors, including but not limited to: The nature of the injury inflicted or suffered; the severity of the perpetrator's conduct; the severity of the harm suffered; the duration of the infliction of the harm; and the extent to which there is permanent or serious harm to the appearance, health, or physical or mental soundness of the victim, including aggravation of pre-existing conditions. No single factor is a prerequisite to establish that the abuse suffered was substantial. Also, the existence of one or more of the factors automatically does not create a presumption that the abuse suffered was substantial. A series of acts taken together may be considered to constitute substantial physical or mental abuse even where no single act alone rises to that level;

(2) The alien possesses credible and reliable information establishing that he or she has knowledge of the details concerning the qualifying criminal activity upon which his or her petition is based. The alien must possess specific facts regarding the criminal activity leading a certifying official to determine that the petitioner has, is, or is likely to provide assistance to the investigation or prosecution of the qualifying criminal activity. . . .

(3) The alien has been helpful, is being helpful, or is likely to be helpful to a certifying agency in the investigation or prosecution of the qualifying criminal activity upon which his or her petition is based, and since the initiation of cooperation, has not refused or failed to provide information and assistance reasonably requested. . . . ; and

(4) The qualifying criminal activity occurred in the United States (including Indian country and U.S. military installations) or in the territories or possessions of the United States, or violated a U.S. federal law that provides for extraterritorial jurisdiction to prosecute the offense in a U.S. federal court.

In addition, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.14(c)(4), prescribes the evidentiary standards and burden of proof in these proceedings:

The burden shall be on the petitioner to demonstrate eligibility for U-1 nonimmigrant status. The petitioner may submit any credible evidence relating to his or her Form I-918 for consideration by [U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)]. USCIS shall conduct a de novo review of all evidence submitted in connection with Form I-918 and may investigate any aspect of the petition. Evidence previously submitted for this or other immigration benefit or relief may be used by USCIS in evaluating the eligibility of a petitioner for U-1 nonimmigrant status. However, USCIS will not be bound by its previous factual determinations. USCIS will determine, in its sole discretion, the evidentiary value of previously or concurrently submitted evidence, including Form I-918, Supplement B, "U Nonimmigrant Status Certification."

#### *Facts and Procedural History*

The petitioner is a native and citizen of Mexico who entered the United States on May 23, 2001 without inspection. The petitioner filed the instant Form I-918, Petition for U Nonimmigrant Status (Form I-918 U petition) with an accompanying U Nonimmigrant Status Certification (Form I-918 Supplement B) on July 26, 2011. On March 8, 2012, the director issued a Request for Evidence (RFE) that the petitioner submit evidence that she had suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of qualifying criminal activity. Counsel responded to the RFE with additional statements, which the director found insufficient to establish the petitioner's eligibility. Accordingly, the director denied the petition and the petitioner's Form I-192, Application for Advance Permission to Enter as a Nonimmigrant. The petitioner timely appealed the denial of the Form I-918 U petition.

On appeal, counsel claims that the petitioner was the victim of a qualifying criminal activity, felonious assault, and she suffered substantial abuse.

#### *Claimed Criminal Activity*

In her declarations, the petitioner recounted that on February 17, 2011, she was walking her children and niece to school when a man pulled her necklace off her neck. She stated that while waiting at the corner for the light to change, she noticed a man on a bicycle behind her. She thought he was also waiting for the light to change to cross the street, but then he pulled her necklace off her neck. When he pulled her necklace off, there were red marks left on her chest and she felt some pain in the back of her neck. The man rode off on his bike, and she began to scream. She flagged a police car and gave them a description of the man. After she dropped off the children at school, the police were waiting for her to identify the man they had in custody. She identified the man even though she was afraid that he would see her, and the police gave her back her necklace.

The Form I-918 Supplement B that the petitioner submitted was signed by [REDACTED] California Sheriff's Department (certifying official), on April 13, 2011. The certifying official lists the criminal activity of which the petitioner was a victim at Part 3.1 as

felonious assault. In Part 3.3, the certifying official refers to California Penal Code (CPC) § 211, robbery, as the criminal activity that was investigated or prosecuted. At Part 3.5, which asks the certifying official to briefly describe the criminal activity being investigated or prosecuted, she indicated that the suspect “ripped chain off [the petitioner] while she was standing on the corner waiting to cross the street with her children.” At Part 3.6, which asks for a description of any known or documented injury to the petitioner, the certifying official stated the petitioner had “minor scratches.”

*Robbery under California Law is not a Qualifying Crime or Criminal Activity*

The County of [REDACTED] Sheriff’s Department Incident Report and court records from the Superior Court of California, [REDACTED] indicate that the suspect was charged with violating CPC § 211 (robbery) against the petitioner, and was convicted of violating CPC § 487(C) (grand theft). The crime of robbery is not specifically listed as a qualifying crime at section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Act. Although the statute encompasses “any similar activity” to the enumerated crimes, the regulation defines “any similar activity” as “criminal offenses in which the nature and elements of the offenses are substantially similar to the statutorily enumerated list of criminal activities.” 8 C.F.R. § 214.14(a)(9). Thus, the nature and elements of the robbery offense must be substantially similar to one of the qualifying criminal activities in the statutorily enumerated list. 8 C.F.R. § 214.14(a)(9). The inquiry, therefore, is not fact-based, but rather entails comparing the nature and elements of the statutes in question.

Under California Penal Code, “[r]obbery is the felonious taking of personal property in the possession of another, from his person or immediate presence, and against his will, accomplished by means of force or fear.” Cal. Penal Code § 211 (West 2013). California law defines assault “as an unlawful attempt, coupled with a present ability, to commit a violent injury on the person of another.” Cal. Penal Code § 240 (West 2013). Assault with a deadly weapon or force likely to produce great bodily injury is defined as, in pertinent part:

- (a)(1) Any person who commits an assault upon the person of another with a deadly weapon or instrument other than a firearm shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for two, three, or four years, or in a county jail for not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), or by both the fine and imprisonment.

Cal. Penal Code § 245 (West 2013).

No elements of robbery under Cal. Penal Code § 211 are similar to assault under Cal. Penal Code §§ 240 or 245. The statute investigated in this case involves taking personal property from an individual through the use of force or fear, and does not specify the commission of a violent injury as a necessary component. Felonious assault, however, involves an attempt, with a present ability, to commit violent injury upon another with a deadly weapon. We recognize that qualifying criminal activity may occur during the commission of a nonqualifying crime; however, the certifying official must provide evidence that the qualifying criminal activity was investigated or prosecuted. Although the certifying official indicated at Part 3.1 of the Form I-918 Supplement B that the petitioner was a victim of felonious assault, there is no evidence that she or any other law enforcement entity investigated felonious assault, and only describes the

petitioner having her chain “ripped” off her while standing on the corner when recounting the criminal activity that was investigated or prosecuted at Part 3.5. The only crime certified at Part 3.3 of the Form I-918 Supplement B was robbery, and the incident report noted that the crime was CPC § 211 (robbery). There is no evidence that the certifying agency investigated or prosecuted an attempted or actual felonious assault. The petitioner has not shown that any crime other than robbery and grand theft were investigated or prosecuted by the law enforcement agency.

On appeal, counsel argues that robbery in violation of CPC § 211 is similar to felonious assault, because both robbery and assault “require an element of ‘fear.’” She claims the fear of immediate injury in robbery is “similar to the fear of violent injury” in assault, and they both have an element of victimization. However, fear is not an element of either assault or felonious assault. In addition, counsel claims that the robbery in the present case is similar to felonious assault because the suspect physically injured the petitioner during the commission of the crime. Counsel states the petitioner was left “with scratches and pain to her neck” after having her necklace pulled off her neck. However, as stated above, the proper inquiry is not an analysis of the factual details underlying the criminal activity, but a comparison of the nature and elements of the crimes that were investigated and the qualifying crimes. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.14(a)(9). The petitioner has not demonstrated that the nature and elements of the criminal offense of which she was a victim, robbery, are substantially similar to those of any of the qualifying crimes at section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Act, including felonious assault.

Here, the evidence in the record and counsel’s contentions fail to establish that the criminal offense of which the petitioner was a victim, robbery, is substantially similar to any of the qualifying crimes at section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Act, including felonious assault. The petitioner is, therefore, not the victim of a qualifying crime or any qualifying criminal activity, as required by section 101(a)(15)(U)(i) of the Act.

*Substantial Physical or Mental Abuse*

As the petitioner did not establish that she was the victim of a qualifying crime or criminal activity, she has also failed to establish that she suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of having been a victim of a qualifying crime or criminal activity, as required by section 101(a)(15)(U)(i)(I) of the Act. Even if the petitioner could establish that she was the victim of a qualifying crime or criminal activity, she has not demonstrated that she suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of her victimization. When assessing whether a petitioner has suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of having been a victim of qualifying criminal activity, USCIS looks at, among other issues, the severity of the perpetrator’s conduct, the severity of the harm suffered, the duration of the infliction of the harm and the extent to which there is permanent or serious harm to the appearance, health, or physical or mental soundness of the victim, including aggravation of pre-existing conditions. 8 C.F.R. § 214.14(b)(1).

According to the Form I-918 Supplement B, the petitioner suffered minor scratches from having her chain ripped off her neck. In her declarations, the petitioner states that as a result of the robbery, she “fear[s] everything and everyone,” she does not leave her house except to take her children to school, she does not wear jewelry, she has nightmares, and her children are afraid. She states further that she feels like she does not “have control over [her] life anymore.” In their statement dated July 6, 2011, therapists

state the petitioner is having “difficulty managing her nervousness and anxiety symptoms resulting from the robbery.” In addition, Mr. [REDACTED] and Ms. [REDACTED] indicate that according to the petitioner, she experienced domestic violence for a year in her previous marriage, and some of these memories are resurfacing.

The evidence in the record fails to establish that the petitioner has suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of the robbery. The Form I-918 Supplement B only indicates that the crime resulted in the petitioner suffering “minor scratches.” Though the petitioner and her therapists generally describe the petitioner as fearful and anxious, they fail to probatively discuss any permanent or serious harm the incident caused to the petitioner’s appearance, health, or physical or mental soundness. While we do not minimize what the petitioner experienced as a victim of a robbery, the overall evidence does not establish that she has suffered resultant substantial physical or mental abuse. Accordingly, the petitioner has not satisfied subsection 101(a)(15)(U)(i)(I) of the Act.

*Possession of Information Concerning Qualifying Criminal Activity*

As the petitioner did not establish that she was the victim of a qualifying crime or criminal activity, she has also failed to establish that she possesses information concerning such a crime or activity, as required by subsection 101(a)(15)(U)(i)(II) of the Act.

*Helpfulness to Authorities Investigating or Prosecuting the Qualifying Criminal Activity*

As the petitioner did not establish that she was the victim of a qualifying crime or criminal activity, she has also failed to establish that she has been, is being or is likely to be helpful to a federal, state, or local law enforcement official, prosecutor, federal or state judge, USCIS or other federal, state or local authorities investigating or prosecuting qualifying criminal activity, as required by subsection 101(a)(15)(U)(i)(III) of the Act.

*Conclusion*

Although the petitioner was helpful to the County of [REDACTED] California Sheriff’s Department in the investigation of the robbery against her, she has not demonstrated that the offense of robbery under California Penal Code is a qualifying crime or substantially similar to any other qualifying criminal activity listed at section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Act. Qualifying criminal activity is a requisite to each statutory element of U nonimmigrant classification. The petitioner’s failure to establish that the offense of which she was the victim is a qualifying criminal activity prevents her from meeting any of the eligibility criteria for U nonimmigrant classification at section 101(a)(15)(U)(i)(I) – (IV) of the Act. The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternate basis for the decision. 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. The petition remains denied.