



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the  
Administrative Appeals Office**

MATTER OF M-E-H-B-

DATE: JAN. 27, 2016

APPEAL OF VERMONT SERVICE CENTER DECISION

PETITION: FORM I-918, PETITION FOR U NONIMMIGRANT STATUS

The Petitioner seeks nonimmigrant classification as a victim of certain qualifying criminal activity. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) § 101(a)(15)(U), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(U). The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the petition. The matter is now before us on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The Director denied the Form I-918, Petition for U Nonimmigrant Status, based on a finding that the Petitioner did not establish that he has been helpful, is being helpful, or is likely to be helpful to a law enforcement official in the investigation or prosecution of the qualifying criminal activity of which the Petitioner was a victim. The Director noted that the Petitioner submitted a Form I-918 Supplement B, U Nonimmigrant Status Certification, on which the certifying official indicated that the Petitioner was not helpful. The Petitioner filed a timely appeal.

On appeal, the Petitioner does not provide a brief or evidence explaining the basis for his appeal, as required at Part 4 of the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion. At Part 3 of the Form I-290B, the Petitioner indicated that he would submit a brief and/or additional evidence within 30 days of filing the appeal. The Petitioner's counsel also indicated in a letter dated May 18, 2015, and accompanying the Form I-290B, that the Petitioner "plans to submit additional evidence and a memorandum of law in support of this appeal/motion to reconsider within 30 days from this filing." As of the date of this decision, we have not received any new evidence or a brief specifically addressing any error in the Director's decision. Instead, the Petitioner submitted with the Form I-290B copies of previously submitted evidence, as well as a letter from [REDACTED] the attorney who represented him in his divorce from his ex-spouse. [REDACTED] states in his letter, dated January 15, 2015, that the Petitioner informed law enforcement officers that he did not want his ex-spouse to be prosecuted due to the Petitioner's concerns regarding a child custody agreement. The letter from [REDACTED] does not specifically address the Director's finding that the Petitioner did not establish that he has been helpful, is being helpful, or is likely to be helpful to a law enforcement official in the investigation or prosecution of qualifying criminal activity.

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 as a basis for the appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v). The Petitioner has not specifically identified any erroneous

*Matter of M-E-H-B-*

conclusion of law or statement of fact in the Director's decision. Accordingly, we must summarily dismiss the appeal in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

Cite as *Matter of M-E-H-B-*, ID#15533 (AAO Jan. 27, 2016)