

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


(b)(6)



Date: JAN 29 2015


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

DISCUSSION: The Acting 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: she was the victim of qualifying criminal activity; she suffered resultant substantial physical or mental abuse; she possessed information regarding qualifying criminal activity; or that she was helpful in the investigation or prosecution of qualifying criminal activity. On appeal, the petitioner 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;

Felonious assault is listed as qualifying criminal activity in clause (iii) of section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Act.

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 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 El Salvador who entered the United States on November 10, 2006, on a B-2 nonimmigrant visa with authorization to remain until May 9, 2007. The petitioner filed the instant Petition for U Nonimmigrant Status (Form I-918 U petition) with an accompanying U Nonimmigrant Status Certification (Form I-918 Supplement B) on May 29, 2012. The petitioner also filed an Application for Advance Permission to Enter as Nonimmigrant (Form I-192) on the same day. On September 27, 2013, the director issued a Request for Evidence (RFE) that the crime listed on the law enforcement certification was a qualifying crime. The petitioner responded with additional evidence, which the director found insufficient to establish the petitioner's eligibility. Accordingly, the director denied the Form I-918 U petition and Form I-192. The petitioner appealed the denial of the Form I-918 U petition. On appeal, the petitioner claims that she suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of being a victim of felonious assault, a qualifying crime.

Claimed Criminal Activity

In her declaration, the petitioner recounted that on December [REDACTED] she was riding the train when a man attempted to take her phone out of her right hand but she resisted. When he was unable to get her phone, he tried to leave the train but the door closed before he could reach it. The petitioner told the train conductor to call the police but before the police arrived, the suspect and two of his friends escaped through the emergency exit at the back of the train. The petitioner indicated that when the police arrived, she gave a description of the suspect, he was apprehended and she identified and testified against him.

The Form I-918 Supplement B that the petitioner submitted was signed by [REDACTED] Chief of Staff, Victim Services, [REDACTED] California, District Attorney's Office (certifying official), on January 10, 2012. The certifying official listed the criminal activity of which the petitioner was a victim at Part 3.1 as felonious assault. In Part 3.3, the certifying official referred to California Penal Code (CPC) §§ 664 and 211, punishment for attempted crimes and robbery, respectively, as the criminal activities that were 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 petitioner was the victim of an attempted strong arm robbery of "her i-phone while she was a passenger on board the [train]."¹ At Part 3.6, which asks for a description of any known or documented injury to the petitioner, the certifying official indicated that the petitioner fears riding public transportation and riding alone, and she "suffered mental duress as a result of the crime; resulting in P.T.S.D."

Analysis

We conduct appellate review on a *de novo* basis. Based on the evidence in the record, we find no error in the director's decision to deny the petitioner's Form I-918 U petition.

¹ The certifying official indicated that the petitioner was present at hearings, but did not corroborate that she testified against the perpetrator.

Robbery under California Law is not Qualifying Criminal Activity

The Form I-918 Supplement B and incident report from the [REDACTED] Police Department indicate that robbery was investigated. 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 Cal. 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 2014). 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 2014). For an assault in California to be classified as a felony, there must be an aggravating factor involved. Felonious assault in California involves assault with a deadly weapon or force likely to produce great bodily injury, assault with caustic chemicals or flammable substances, or assault against a specific class of persons (such as peace officers, fire fighters, custodial officers or school employees). Cal. Penal Code §§ 244, 244.5, 245, 245.3, 245.5 (West 2014).

No elements of robbery under Cal. Penal Code § 211 are similar to felonious assault under Cal. Penal Code §§ 244, 244.5, 245, 245.3, or 245.5. The statute investigated in this case involves taking personal property from an individual through the use of force or fear, and does not require violent or great bodily injury, the use of a weapon or caustic/flammables substances, or assault against a protected class as a necessary component. Felonious assault in California, however, involves an attempt, with a present ability, to commit violent injury upon another with an aggravating factor such as those listed above. The certifying official’s indication at Part 3.1 that the petitioner was the victim of a felonious assault is without support in the record. 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 robbery. There is no evidence that the certifying agency investigated an attempted or actual felonious assault against the petitioner, and the certifying official does not explain why at Part 3.3 she provided a citation for robbery, not felonious assault under California law, if a felonious assault against the petitioner was actually investigated or prosecuted.² 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. Here, the evidence of record does not demonstrate that the crime of felony assault was investigated or prosecuted.

On appeal, the petitioner claims that the crime of attempted robbery is similar to felonious assault because “felonious assault is a lesser related offense to the attempted robbery.” The petitioner states that robbery is a crime of violence and she suffered injury as a result of the crime. However, as stated above, the standard for inclusion as a qualifying criminal activity is that the crime investigated or prosecuted is “substantially

² We determine, in our sole discretion, the evidentiary value of a Form I-918 Supplement B. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.14(c)(4).

similar” to one of the enumerated crimes, not that it is a lesser included offense, and 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).³ The petitioner has not provided the requisite statutory analysis to demonstrate that the nature and elements of Cal. Penal Code § 211 (robbery) are substantially similar to Cal. Penal Code §§ 244, 244.5, 245, 245.3, or 245.5 (felonious assault) or any other qualifying crime at section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Act. The petitioner is, therefore, not the victim of 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 qualifying 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 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 she was the victim of qualifying criminal activity, she has also failed to establish that she 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 she was the victim of qualifying 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.

Jurisdiction

As the petitioner did not establish that she was the victim of qualifying criminal activity, she has also failed to establish that 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, as required by section 101(a)(15)(U)(i)(IV) of the Act.

³ On appeal, the petitioner also asserts that robbery is a crime involving moral turpitude (CIMT) and an aggravated felony, and that therefore the crime of robbery in the immigration context is severe. However, the standard is not that the qualifying criminal activity be “severe,” or a CIMT or an aggravated felony, but rather that the crime investigated or prosecuted be on the enumerated list of qualifying criminal activity at section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Act, or substantially similar to one of the enumerated crimes.



Page 7

Conclusion

The petitioner has failed to establish that she was the victim of a qualifying crime. She 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.