

(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: Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER FILE: 
NOV 17 2014

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

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

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: he was the victim of qualifying criminal activity; he suffered resultant substantial physical or mental abuse; he possessed information regarding qualifying criminal activity; or he was helpful in the investigation or prosecution of qualifying criminal activity. On appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional evidence.

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[.]¹

According to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.14(a)(9), the term “any similar activity” as used in section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Act “refers to criminal offenses in which the nature and elements of the offenses are *substantially similar* to the statutorily enumerated list of criminal activities.” (Emphasis added).

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

¹ 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, Public Law No. 113-4 (VAWA 2013), which came into effect on March 7, 2013, amended section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Act to include these two crimes as qualifying criminal activities.

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 Trinidad and Tobago who entered the United States on January 17, 2001 on a B-2 nonimmigrant visa with authorization to remain until July 16, 2001. The petitioner filed the instant Petition for U Nonimmigrant Status (Form I-918 U petition) with an accompanying incomplete U Nonimmigrant Status Certification (Form I-918 Supplement B) on September 14, 2012. On November 8, 2012, the director issued a Request for Evidence (RFE) that the petitioner suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of qualifying criminal activity, that he was helpful to the investigation or prosecution of the qualifying criminal activity, and that he possessed information of the criminal activity. The director also requested a detailed victim statement and a properly completed Form I-918 Supplement B. The petitioner, through counsel, responded to the RFE with an updated Form I-918 Supplement B and additional evidence, which the director found insufficient to establish the petitioner's eligibility. Accordingly, the director denied the Form I-918 U petition. The petitioner, through counsel, timely appealed the denial of the Form I-918 U petition.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director failed to consider all of the evidence presented when she denied the petition.

Claimed Criminal Activity

In his statement, the petitioner recounted that on July 27, 2001, he was instructed by his manager to speak to one of his employees about the employee's work performance. When the petitioner was speaking with his employee, the employee became upset and threatened the petitioner. After the employee left, the petitioner was afraid that the employee would come back and harm him so he called the police to document the incident.

The petitioner submitted two Forms I-918 Supplement B; one at the time of initial filing and one in response to the director's RFE. The first Form I-918 Supplement B that the petitioner submitted was missing the first page and did not indicate what criminal activity was investigated or prosecuted.

The second Form I-918 Supplement B that the petitioner submitted along with his RFE response was signed by [REDACTED] Crimes Against Persons, [REDACTED] Minnesota, Police Department (certifying official), on January 2, 2013. The certifying official listed the criminal activity of which the petitioner was a victim at Part 3.1 as assault/threats, and listed the statutory citations for the crimes at Part 3.3 as Minnesota Statutes §§ 609.713 and 609.224, terroristic threats and assault, respectively. When describing the criminal activity being investigated or prosecuted, Sergeant [REDACTED] indicated that on July 27, 2001, the petitioner was threatened by his employee after he spoke to him about his work performance. The employee told the petitioner, "I'm gonna come back and get you for this." The certifying official indicated that the petitioner did not suffer any physical injuries but was "nervous and scared about the whole event," and it impacted him "psychologically for many months."

*Analysis*²

Victim of Qualifying Criminal Activity

The incident report indicates that the crime investigated was threats, and the second Form I-918 Supplement B indicates that assault/threats were investigated. These two types of crimes are not specifically listed as qualifying crimes 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 crime investigated, assault/threats, 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.

The record contains no evidence that the certifying official or any other law enforcement entity investigated a qualifying crime. The incident report indicates that the petitioner "only wanted to document the incident" and the police did not conduct a follow-up or investigation of any qualifying crime. The petitioner claims that the employee threatened him and he was afraid that he would act on his threats. 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 shown that any crime was investigated by the law enforcement agency, or that threats are substantially similar to any qualifying criminal activity. The petitioner is, therefore, not the victim of any qualifying criminal activity, as required by section 101(a)(15)(U)(i) of the Act.

² The AAO conducts review on a *de novo* basis.

Substantial Physical or Mental Abuse

As the petitioner did not establish that he was the victim of qualifying criminal activity, he has also failed to establish that he suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of having been a victim of qualifying criminal activity, as required by section 101(a)(15)(U)(i)(I) of the Act.

Possession of Information Concerning Qualifying Criminal Activity

As the petitioner did not establish that he was the victim of qualifying criminal activity, he has also failed to establish that he possesses information concerning such a crime or activity, as required by section 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 he was the victim of qualifying criminal activity, he has also failed to establish that he 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

The petitioner has failed to establish that he was the victim of a qualifying crime. He is consequently ineligible for nonimmigrant classification under section 101(a)(15)(U)(i) of the Act and the appeal must be 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). Here, that burden has not been met. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition remains denied.