

B9

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

**Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F  
Washington, D.C. 20536

[Redacted]

FILE: [Redacted]  
EAC 02 192 52318

Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: AUG 15 2003

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Petition for Special Immigrant Battered 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:

[Redacted]

**PUBLIC COPY**

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

*Robert P. Wiemann*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of Panama who is seeking classification as a special immigrant pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii), as the battered spouse of a United States citizen.

The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish that he: (1) has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage; or is the parent of a child who has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage; and (2) entered into the marriage to the citizen or lawful permanent resident in good faith. The director, therefore, denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the Service erred in denying the petition because the petitioner demonstrated through the documentary evidence submitted that he was subjected to extreme cruelty by his wife. He states that the crux of the petitioner's case is that he was emotionally abused during the years he lived with his spouse. Counsel further asserts that the Service erred in holding that the petitioner did not provide sufficient evidence that he married his wife in good faith.

8 C.F.R. § 204.2(c)(1) states, in pertinent part, that:

(i) A spouse may file a self-petition under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) or 204(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act for his or her classification as an immigrant relative or as a preference immigrant if he or she:

(A) Is the spouse of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States;

(B) Is eligible for immigrant classification under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) or 203(a)(2)(A) of the Act based on that relationship;

(C) Is residing in the United States;

(D) Has resided in the United States with the citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse;

(E) Has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage; or is the parent of a child who has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage;

(F) Is a person of good moral character;

(G) Is a person whose deportation (removal) would result in extreme hardship to himself, herself, or his or her child; and

(H) Entered into the marriage to the citizen or lawful permanent resident in good faith.

The record reflects that the petitioner entered the United States as a visitor on April 29, 1999. The petitioner married his United States citizen spouse on October 13, 1999 in New York City, New York. On May 15, 2002, a self-petition was filed by the petitioner claiming eligibility as a special immigrant alien who has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, his U.S. citizen spouse during their marriage.

The director reviewed and discussed all the evidence furnished by the petitioner to establish that he has met the requirements of 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(E) and (H). That discussion need not be repeated here. The director concluded that while the Service understands that the failure of a marriage is stressful, the petitioner's relationship with his wife, as described, did not constitute extreme mental cruelty as envisioned by Congress. He further concluded that the evidence furnished, including correspondence, affidavit, and evidence of a bank account, was insufficient to establish the existence of a good-faith marriage. The AAO is in agreement with this conclusion.

While counsel asserts that the Service erred in denying the petition because the petitioner did provide sufficient proof to establish eligibility, the documents furnished by the petitioner were evaluated and discussed by the director in his decision and they were found to be insufficient. No additional documentation, however, was furnished by the petitioner, on appeal, to overcome the director's findings that the petitioner had failed to establish that he has been the subject of extreme cruelty, and that he entered into the marriage to the citizen in good faith, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(E) and (H).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.