

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B9

FILE:

[REDACTED]
EAC 07 208 50066

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **MAR 04 2009**

IN RE:

Petitioner: [REDACTED]

PETITION:

Petition for Immigrant Abused Spouse Pursuant to Section 204(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(B)(ii)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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 you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom, Acting Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner seeks immigrant classification under section 204(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(B)(ii), as an alien battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by a lawful permanent resident of the United States. The director denied the petition because the petitioner did not establish that she had a qualifying relationship with a U.S. lawful permanent resident, was eligible for immigrant classification under section 203(a)(2)(A) of the Act based on such a relationship and because the petitioner did not overcome the bar to approval of her petition at section 204(c) of the Act.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner provided sufficient evidence, but the director did not accord any weight to the documents submitted. Counsel does not specifically address the stated grounds for denial and submits no brief or additional evidence on appeal.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) prescribes that an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. Counsel has not specifically identified any error of law or fact in the director's decision. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.