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I. INTRODUCTION

Scared, panicked, running, looking for a place to hide, she lives in a place where no one will help her. A phone call to the police is of no use because they are easily bribed to look the other way. After years of torture, Tatiana Burbano decides to escape from her husband, a man who has raped her, beat her, and tried to kill her on numerous occasions. In her mind she has finally reached her destination, her safe haven, the United States. However, is the United States truly her safe haven? Has she truly escaped? This is one of many horrific stories where a woman, who has been violently abused, seeks freedom from constant torment. Domestic violence victims all over the world face this constant horror and yearn to find safety.

Across the globe, women who are domestic violence victims are living in fear, worry, and depression that a loved one may get angry and hit them, rape them, or even kill them. In the midst of their despair, the word “asylum” gives them some relief. Asylum is defined in Webster’s dictionary as a “place of retreat and security.” The opportunity for asylum gives women who are domestic violence victims the ability to escape and live a life without

---

constant fear. These women need asylum; however, the opportunity and availability of asylum varies from nation to nation.

Internationally, women who are domestic violence victims have the right to, and may seek, asylum in many countries within the European Union in order to find a sanctuary from the place where they are a victim of abuse. In contrast, domestic violence victims seeking asylum in the United States have an unclear future. In Matter of A-B-, former Attorney General Jeff Sessions ruled that international women who are domestic violence victims are no longer eligible for asylum in the United States. This ruling contradicts international law and protections of human rights, further victimizing those most in need of protection. Months after Matter of A-B-, was published, District Court Judge Emmet G. Sullivan ruled, in Grace v. Whitaker, to give back to domestic violence victims the avenue to apply for asylum in the United States. Despite this ruling, the right to asylum for women who are domestic violence victims is still uncertain because President Trump’s administration has appealed, and there is no legislative protection for women who are domestic violence victims yet.

Alongside the lack of legal certainty, lack of legislative protection, and the lack of acceptance of domestic violence asylum seekers, the United States also lacks gender-sensitive and adequate medical procedures to serve domestic violence victims in immigration detention centers. More often than not, while seeking asylum or awaiting a decision from the immigration court, domestic violence victims face possible detention. In these detention
centers, there are no gender sensitive trainings for the staff, and while there may be a healthcare policy in effect, the enforcement of such policy is lacking.\textsuperscript{10} The lack of gender sensitive care and medical attention further prolongs the abuse that these domestic violence victims are trying to escape.

In comparison, Sweden, Germany, and Canada have implemented asylum policies to combat high volumes of asylum seekers without targeting a specific group from seeking asylum. Sweden has called for stricter policies and global sharing.\textsuperscript{11} Germany has adopted the Council of European Convention on preventing and combatting violence against women and domestic violence of 2011 (hereafter Istanbul Convention),\textsuperscript{12} which provides aid in preventing and combatting violence against women and domestic violence.\textsuperscript{13} Furthermore, countries in the European Union have training for detention center staff geared towards providing gender-sensitive care to domestic violence victims.\textsuperscript{14} While training procedures are not strictly enforced,\textsuperscript{15} the need to provide gender-sensitive attention to domestic violence victims is recognized within the European Union.\textsuperscript{16} Conversely, Canada grants asylum to domestic violence victims; however, it has adopted a high threshold for proving persecution by domestic violence.\textsuperscript{17} Canada has also worked closely with the United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees (UNHCR) to provide asylum for individuals fleeing their countries.\textsuperscript{18}

This Comment aims to interpret the United States’ asylum laws that impact domestic violence victims and analyze the effect they have both domestically and globally on those victims. Additionally, this Comment

\textsuperscript{10} Cf. id.

\textsuperscript{11} Statens Offentliga Utredningar [SOU] 2018:22 Sweden’s migration and asylum policy [government report series].


\textsuperscript{13} Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence, 2011 O.J. 25, art. 60 (210) 1, 17 [hereinafter The Istanbul Convention].

\textsuperscript{14} EUR. PARLIAMENT, supra note 12.


\textsuperscript{16} The Istanbul Convention, supra note 13.
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will analyze and compare Sweden, Germany, and Canada’s asylum laws and policies with United States’ asylum laws and policies in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of the effects these countries’ asylum laws have on their societies. Finally, this Comment will provide judicial and legislative recommendations to replace the current United States asylum policy with one that incorporates a domestic violence victim’s right to be granted asylum or receive asylum and implements a gender sensitive approach to medical care in detention centers.

A. Background

Many countries have signed the United Nations’ 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (and the Protocol amending it effective in 1967) and the 1948 Declaration of Human Rights and have used these treaties as guides for their own asylum laws. The United States briefly deviated from these guidelines when refusing asylum to domestic violence victims. The United States case, Matter of A-B-, has caused controversy, both locally and globally. Since then, Judge Sullivan’s ruling in Grave v. Whitaker, has rectified the deviation from international human rights guidelines. However, this may not be final and is subject to change since a notice of appeal has been filed in the United States District Court of Columbia.

22. Id.
1. United States

In the United States, more than 318,000 affirmative asylum applications were pending in 2018. Additionally, there were over 733,000 defensive asylum cases pending. On average, affirmative asylum seekers who receive asylum relief waited more than 1,000 days to be granted asylum. Asylum seekers face being put in detention centers while awaiting a decision. Furthermore, recent case law in the United States has provided an unclear future for domestic violence victims seeking asylum in the United States. In 2018, former Attorney General Jeff Sessions ruled in Matter of A-B that the United States would no longer be accepting asylum applications from individuals who are seeking asylum because of domestic violence, thus restricting these domestic violence victims who wanted to seek asylum in the United States from being granted protection. Then, in January 2019, District Judge Sullivan ruled in Grace v. Whitaker that the holding in Matter of A-B was inconsistent with existing interpretation of asylum laws.

Prior to Matter of A-B and Grace, in 2014, under the Obama administration, case law allowed domestic violence victims to seek asylum. The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA), in 2014, in Matter of A-R-C-G, recognized domestic violence victims as a particular social group, meaning that domestic violence victims fit within the definition of individuals eligible to apply for asylum. In Matter of A-R-C-G, a woman applied for asylum after years of experiencing brutal physical and psychological abuse.

25. Asylum in the United States, AMERICAN IMMIGR. COUNCIL (May 14, 2018), https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/asylum-united-states (defining affirmative asylum seekers as individuals who are physically present in the United States when requesting asylum and are awaiting a decision after filing an application and interviewing with USCIS).


27. Id.


33. Id. at 389.
court granted her asylum reasoning that the woman was of a “particular social group” and there was no government remedy in Guatemala.\textsuperscript{34} However, in 2018, in \textit{Matter of A-B-}, former Attorney General Jeff Sessions arrived at a different conclusion, overturning the precedent from \textit{Matter of A-R-C-G-}.\textsuperscript{35} In \textit{Matter of A-B-}, the respondent’s husband beat her, raped her, and threatened to kill her on numerous occasions.\textsuperscript{36} She sought protection from the Salvadorian government, but the local authorities were “unwilling or unable to protect” her.\textsuperscript{37} The types of abuse endured by the women in \textit{Matter of A-B-} and those in \textit{Matter of A-R-C-G-} are strikingly similar; however, the rulings were opposite. In \textit{Matter of A-B-}, the court held women who endured domestic violence in their country and sought asylum in the United States would not be granted asylum because they no longer legally belonged to a particular social group and did not meet the criteria for asylum.\textsuperscript{38}

Shortly thereafter, in 2019, twelve adults and children, in \textit{Grace v. Whitaker}, brought a class action in a federal district court.\textsuperscript{39} Plaintiffs alleged that denying them the ability to seek asylum, even though the asylum officer believed that there was a credible fear of persecution, was a violation of immigration laws.\textsuperscript{40} District Judge Sullivan found that the decision and policy of denying domestic violence victims from exercising their right to apply for asylum at the border in the manner articulated in \textit{Matter of A-B-} violated immigration laws.\textsuperscript{41} Applying \textit{Matter of A-B-} at the border would have resulted in deporting many women who were seeking asylum in the United States before they could apply for it, robbing them of the opportunity to apply for asylum in the future.\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Grace v. Whitaker}, for the time being,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Id. at 388–89.
\item \textsuperscript{35} See generally \textit{Matter of A-B-}, 27 I&N at 346.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Id. at 321.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Grace v. Whitaker, 344 F. Supp. 3d 96, 104 (D.D.C. 2018).
\item \textsuperscript{40} See id. at 105.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Id. at 146.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Cf. id. at 133.
\end{itemize}
allows domestic violence victims to continue seeking asylum in the United States.\textsuperscript{43} However, the Trump Administration has appealed.\textsuperscript{44}

Following \textit{Grace v. Whitaker}, Senator Patrick Leahy and Representative Zoe Lofgren led the bicameral introduction of the Refugee Protection Act of 2019.\textsuperscript{45} The Act makes asylum claims by domestic violence victims more viable.\textsuperscript{46} It restores the United States’ refugee and asylum system in response to the Trump Administration’s decisions on asylum.\textsuperscript{47}

2. Sweden

“Sweden has registered around 400,000 asylum requests since 2012.”\textsuperscript{48} Sweden has continued to recognize domestic violence victims as a part of particular social groups allowing them to be able to seek asylum.\textsuperscript{49} Over the years, the number of asylum seekers in Sweden has grown tremendously\textsuperscript{50} and to address the influx of asylum requests, Sweden has planned stricter policies and requested global responsibility-sharing in its 2018 asylum policy, in order to help its national economy.\textsuperscript{51} However, based on Sweden’s 2018 election results, the future of Sweden’s immigration law may change drastically. During the September 2018 election there was a one month deadlock\textsuperscript{52} because “no party in Sweden [was able] to agree to a coalition

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{43} See generally id.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{50} See, e.g., “Now everyone will become super nationalistic”: Sweden’s backlash against immigrants and the rise of the right, CBS NEWS (Apr. 12, 2019), https://www.cbsnews.com/news/sweden-rise-of-the-right-immigrants-unwelcome-cbsn-originals/ [https://perma.cc/YAV6-P83X].
\end{itemize}
deal to form a [new] government.”53 The Sweden Democrats held majority votes, and they were broadening political views to grow their platform.54 The Sweden Democrats ran on an anti-immigration platform,55 that would have had a significant negative impact on the number of asylum requests Sweden approves.56 Sweden Democrats’ anti-immigration platform attracted many lower-income and lower-educated voters burdened by unemployment and economic risks who blamed the influx of migrants.57 Now that Sweden Democrats hold 18% of the votes in parliament depending on whether the majority supports their anti-immigration policies,58 there may be many anti-immigration policies and reforms that come to light in the next few years adversely affecting asylum based on domestic violence.59

3. Germany

“The German constitution grants asylum to those who are victims of political persecution.”60 Political persecution means “danger to life and limb, imprisonment or other violations of human dignity on the basis of race, religion, nationality, political convictions or belonging to a particular social group.”61 The political persecution needs to be inflicted by a state actor from the individual’s country of origin.62 Once the individual is eligible for asylum, he or she will receive a residence permit to live Germany for

54. Id.
57. Id.
58. Id.
61. Id.
62. Id.
three years. If, during the three years, the individual is no longer in fear of their home country, the individual needs to return to his or her home country. However, if the circumstances in the individual’s home country have not changed, then the three-year residency permit will be renewed.

Germany has adopted and ratified the Istanbul Convention. The Istanbul Convention’s legislative framework recognizes gender-based violence as persecution and the importance of providing a gender-sensitive interpretation for particular social groups regarding reception procedures and support services for asylum seekers.

In 2015, German Chancellor Angela Merkel adopted an open door approach for asylum seekers. Those who had originally sought asylum in another European country could now seek asylum in Germany. Germany’s number of asylum seekers rose to 1.4 million. The number of asylum seekers registered with the Office of Migrants and Refugees (BAMF) in 2015 was close to 890,000. The number fell to about 280,000 asylum seekers registered with the BAMF in 2016 and 186,644 in 2017.

Germany claims the decrease in asylum applications within the past few years was caused in part by the “closing of the Balkan and Mediterranean routes previously used by many migrants to get to Europe” and by better equipping German authorities to determine asylum seekers’ true identities. Chancellor Merkel’s plan to “establish transit centers close to the [Austrian] border” where asylum seekers in Germany, but currently registered in another European Union country, “will be processed before being returned to [the country where they first sought asylum]” will contribute to the further decrease in the number of asylum application. In May 2019, the German Interior

63. Id.
64. Id.
65. Id.
66. EUR. PARLIAMENT, supra note 12, at 9.
67. Id.
68. Id.
70. Id.
72. Id.
73. Id.
Minister Horst Seehofer proposed the Orderly Return Bill which further proposed tougher rules and regulations for migrants and asylum seekers.75

4. Canada

“Canada was the world’s ninth-largest recipient of asylum claims” in 2017,76 “with 47,800 claims registered[,] more than double the 23,600 claims in the previous year.”77 In Canada, domestic violence victims are recognized as part of a particular social group. However, women escaping domestic violence encounter significant challenges to provide evidence that their home state is unwilling or unable to protect them from their abuser.78 Canadian courts have adopted a high threshold for determining when claimants have provided sufficient evidence.79 Even when the claimants have evidence of state unwillingness to help and lack of legal remedies against domestic abuse, many claimants have still failed to satisfy Canada’s high threshold of evidence.80 Despite this high threshold, some woman have been granted asylum based on domestic violence claims.81 For example, in Narvaez v. Canada, [1995] 89 F.C. 94 (Can.), an Ecuadorian woman who was raped and abused by her husband was granted asylum.82 Narvaez proved she was a victim of domestic violence and also proved the Ecuador government was not providing protection based on evidence that the Ecuadorian police took bribes from her husband to cover the abuse.83 Thus, the court granted her asylum based on her claim.84

77. Id.
79. Id.
80. See id.
81. Id.
82. See generally id.
83. Id., paras. 22, 27.
84. Id.
Canada has also cooperated with the UNHCR to provide asylum for domestic violence victims. On January 11, 2019, a young Saudi woman’s story made international headlines when seeking asylum after fleeing domestic violence. She had fled from her abusive family but was stopped at the Bangkok airport, in Thailand, by immigration officers who denied her entry and seized her passport. The young woman, afraid for her life, barricaded herself in a hotel room. The UNHCR requested Canada to accept her as a refugee, and Prime Minister Justin Trudeau agreed to grant her asylum, stating that Canada has, “always stood up for human rights and women’s rights around the world.”

II. APPLICABLE LAW

The applicable law for domestic violence victims seeking asylum is divided into four sections: (A) International laws, (B) European Union laws, (C) United States laws, and (D) Canadian laws.

A. International Laws

The United Nations ratified two relevant international laws regarding asylum seekers’ rights: (1) the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and (2) The United Nations 1951 Refugee Convention. Agencies have been created to implement these laws, including the UNHCR, the leading international Refugee Agency, a global organization dedicated to protecting rights for asylum seekers.

1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: “(1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution. (2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions...”

86. Id.
87. Id.
88. Id.
89. Id.
90. Id.
genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.**94

2. The 1951 Refugee Convention

The 1951 Refugee Convention is the centerpiece of international refugee protection today.**95 Refugee rights are grounded in Article 14 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was ratified on December 10, 1948. The Declaration recognizes the right of persons to seek asylum from persecution in other countries.**96 Under Article I of the 1951 Refugee Convention, in order to be able to seek asylum and become a refugee, a refugee must:

- be a person outside of his/her country of nationality or habitual residence and has a well-founded fear of persecution because of his/her race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion, and is unable or unwilling to avail himself/herself of the protection of that country or to return there, for fear of persecution.**97

Governments who have signed onto the Convention are responsible for protecting refugees.**98 The UNHCR maintains a “watching brief” of host governments that are primarily responsible for protecting refugees, intervening if necessary to ensure bona fide refugees are granted asylum and are not forcibly returned to their countries where their lives may be in danger.**99

3. UNHCR: The United Nations Refugee Agency

Individual countries are responsible for carrying out refugee status determinations (RSD).**100 However, when countries are unable or unwilling to determine the status of an asylum seeker, the UNHCR may get involved to provide registration of asylum seekers.**101 In situations where national
procedures do not exist or are insufficient to protect an individual, the UNHCR is compelled to conduct RSDs under its mandate.\textsuperscript{102}

In 2013, the UNHCR registered a record high of 203,200 individual asylum applications.\textsuperscript{103} As a result, the UNHCR’s RSDs backlog rose to a historical high of 252,800 pending applications.\textsuperscript{104} However, even with the backlog, the UNHCR is continuing to explore and implement measures that enhance the fairness, quality and efficiency of the RSD operations and procedures.\textsuperscript{105}

\textbf{B. European Union Law}

The European Union has a Common European Asylum System (CEAS) by which all European Union member states must abide.\textsuperscript{106} Additionally, the Council of Europe has adopted the Istanbul Convention, which provides for legal actions against violence against women and legal processes for victims of domestic violence seeking asylum.\textsuperscript{107}

1. The Common European Asylum System (CEAS)

The CEAS provides a common minimum standard of treatment for all asylum seekers and applicants in the European Union.\textsuperscript{108} Although there is a common legal framework for asylum laws in the European Union, in practice each nation treats asylum seekers and application differently.\textsuperscript{109} This divergence between member states in treatment of asylum seekers contributes to encourage secondary movements and influences asylum seekers’ selection of country to seek asylum in.\textsuperscript{110} The goal of the CEAS is to create a system that provides orderly and safe pathways to the European Union from third world countries and to move away from poorly implemented and uncontrolled irregular migratory flows.\textsuperscript{111} The CEAS allows asylum for people fleeing persecution or serious harm. The process includes the following steps:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[102.] Asylum and Refugee Status Determination, supra note 100.
  \item[103.] Asylum and Refugee Status Determination, UNHCR STATISTICAL Y.B., 2013, at 54, 56.
  \item[104.] Niamh Kinchin, The Intersectionality of Domestic and Global Accountability, 87 STATISTICAL ADMIN. L. FORUM 60, 62 (2017).
  \item[105.] Asylum and Refugee Status Determination, supra note 100.
  \item[106.] CEAS, supra note 2.
  \item[107.] The Istanbul Convention, supra note 13, art. 60.
  \item[108.] CEAS, supra note 2.
  \item[109.] Id.
  \item[110.] Id.
  \item[111.] Id.
\end{itemize}
1. An application for asylum is made.

2. Reception Conditions Directive: Asylum applicants benefit from common, minimum material reception conditions, such as housing and food.

3. European Agency for the Operational Management of large-scale IT Systems in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice: The applicant is fingerprinted, the information is sent to the Eurodac database, and the data is used to help identify the country responsible for the asylum application.

4. Qualification Directive and Asylum Procedures Directive: The asylum applicant is interviewed to determine whether he/she may qualify for refugee status or subsidiary protection.

5. If the asylum is not granted at first, the refusal can be appealed in court.
   a. If the negative decision is overturned on appeal, the applicant will be granted asylum.
   b. However, if there is confirmation of the negative decision by the court the applicant may be returned to the country of origin or transit.

6. If the refugee or subsidiary protection status is granted: This gives the person certain rights, such as a residence permit, access to the labor market, and health care (Qualification Directive).112

2. The Istanbul Convention

The Istanbul Convention is based on the understanding that violence against women is a form of gender-based violence.113 Countries that sign onto the Convention take on an obligation to fully address and take measures to prevent violence against women and protect victims of violence.114

Article 60 of the Convention addresses three aspects: (1) parties to the Convention must provide the legislative framework to recognize gender-based violence as a ground for persecution within the meaning of Article 1 of the 1951 Refugee Convention; (2) a gender sensitive interpretation must be given by states to all the other grounds of Article 1, e.g., membership

112. Id.
113. The Istanbul Convention, supra note 13, art. 60.
114. Id.
of a social group; and (3) states must develop gender sensitive reception procedures and support services for asylum seekers.115

C. Germany

The right to asylum is embedded into article 16a of the German Basic Law but is only afforded to individuals who have traveled from unsafe third world countries.116 The Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) then determines whether or not an individual should be afforded protection from their home countries.117

1. Article 16a German Basic Law

This section of German Basic Law gives a person the right to asylum.118 Article 16(a)(1) states: “Persons persecuted on political grounds shall have the right of asylum.”119 Further, Article 16(a)(2) presumes “that a foreigner from such state is not persecuted, unless he presents evidence justifying the conclusion that, contrary to this presumption, he is persecuted on political grounds.”120

D. United States Law

The United States has an affirmative asylum process that lays out the steps for an asylum seeker who is looking to gain asylum in the United States.121 The United States enacted the Refugee Act of 1980,122 which tries to address the realities of modern refugee problems. For a while, case law in the United States allowed domestic violence victims to seek asylum,
but Matter of A-B- changed that\textsuperscript{123} and completely barred domestic violence victims from obtaining asylum.\textsuperscript{124} However, Matter of A-B no longer sets precedent, it was overturned by the decision in Grace v. Whitaker, which now allows domestic violence victims to seek asylum.\textsuperscript{125}

1. The Immigration Court Process

Immigration courts decide various cases regarding removal proceedings and hear asylum claims.\textsuperscript{126} Immigration courts have approximately 400 immigration judges who preside over sixty-three United States Immigration Courts.\textsuperscript{127} Immigration courts have twice the caseload of federal and district court judges, tighter budgets, and far less administrative support.\textsuperscript{128}

Immigrants have basic rights under the United States Constitution, through the right to equal protection and the right to due process.\textsuperscript{129} However, immigrants are not entitled to a court appointed attorney and eighty-six percent of immigrants who are detained appear without an attorney present.\textsuperscript{130} Immigration trials are civil trials, rather than criminal trials;\textsuperscript{131} however, the proceedings very much resemble a criminal trial.\textsuperscript{132} For instance, immigrants who have been convicted of crimes, even low level offenses, are often subject to mandatory detention during their immigration hearings and are brought into the court room wearing a jumpsuit and shackles.\textsuperscript{133}

\begin{thebibliography}{1}
\bibitem{124} Id.
\bibitem{126} See Fact Sheet: Immigration Courts, supra note 26.
\bibitem{129} Fact Sheet: Immigration Courts, supra note 26.
\bibitem{131} See Fact Sheet: Immigration Courts, supra note 26.
\bibitem{132} See Marouf, supra note 128.
\bibitem{133} Id.
\end{thebibliography}
Immigration proceedings are drastically different from judicial court proceedings. The Department of Justice Executive Office for Immigration Review, under the power of the Attorney General, operates the immigration court system. Immigration courts are not part of the judicial branch; rather, immigration judges are appointed by the Attorney General. Those appointed as judge in the immigration courts often have political views that align with immigration enforcement, whereas judges sitting in federal courts are independent members of the United States judiciary.

If an immigration proceeding outcome is unfavorable, an immigrant may appeal the deportation order to the Board of Immigration Appeals, a Virginia-based Department of Justice agency. However, only a small percentage of immigrants choose to appeal. The Board of Immigration Appeals may affirm an opinion without providing any rationale or explanation for the outcome.

The Board of Immigration Appeals may affirm an opinion without providing any rationale or explanation for the outcome. The Attorney General also holds the power to overrule and remove Board members at will. The United States laws also allow the Attorney General to intervene in the appeals process; “the Attorney General can take over the case at the request of the Board of Immigration Appeals or can direct it to himself. Historically, [Attorneys General] have only done this once or twice a year.” However, former Attorney General Jeff Sessions intervened four times in 2018.

If there is no favorable outcome at the Board of Immigration Appeals level, an immigrant can appeal and file a petition for review to the United States Court of Appeals. These petitions must be filed within thirty days of the Board of Immigration appeals decision. However, unlike the Board of Immigration, once an appeal reaches the federal level, the individuals requesting asylum are no longer afforded protection from deportation.

---

134. See id.
136. See Marouf, supra note 128.
137. See id.
138. Id.
139. Id.
140. Id.
141. Marouf, supra note 128.
142. Id.
143. Id.
144. Id.
145. Id.
146. Id.
147. Id.

512
Immigrants appealing the federal appellate court risk deportation while awaiting a decision.\textsuperscript{148}

Occasionally, a district court judge will certify a case as a class action suit and order an injunction applying to all members of a defined class.\textsuperscript{149} If these members are of a nationally located class, then the injunction will apply nationally.\textsuperscript{150} Thus, any injunction or order that requires the United States Citizenship and Immigration services (USCIS) to act in a certain way are issued from the federal district courts\textsuperscript{151}

\section*{2. The Affirmative Asylum Process}

The affirmative asylum process is for individuals who are physically present in the United States when requesting asylum and are not in removal proceedings.\textsuperscript{152} By contrast, the defensive asylum process is when an individual requests asylum as a defense against removal or deportation proceedings from the US.\textsuperscript{153} There are seven steps an individual must undergo to apply for asylum. The steps are as follows:

1. Arrive in the U.S.,
2. Apply for asylum,
3. Undergo fingerprint and background/security checks,
4. Receive an interview notice,
5. Interview,
6. Asylum officer makes determination on eligibility and supervisory asylum, officer reviews the decision,
7. Receive a decision.\textsuperscript{154}

\begin{flushright}
148. U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, ADJUDICATOR’S FIELD MANUAL
149. Id.
150. Id.
151. Id.
153. Id.
154. Id.
\end{flushright}
3. Immigration and Nationality Act (INA)

Prior to the INA’s creation in 1952, there were a variety of statutes that governed immigration law. The INA gives individuals the right to apply for asylum in the United States. Section 1158(a)(1) of the INA states that:

Any alien who is physically present in the United States or who arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of arrival and including an alien who is brought to the United States after having been interdicted in international or United States waters), irrespective of such alien’s status, may apply for asylum in accordance with this section or, where applicable, section 1225(b) of this title. Section 1158(a)(1) does not apply if the “alien’s life or freedom would not be threatened on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion, and where the alien would have access to a full and fair procedure for determining a claim to asylum or equivalent temporary protection.” However, if the Attorney General finds that it is in the public interest for the alien to receive asylum in the United States, then the Attorney General will allow an application for asylum. Essentially, an individual must be persecuted for the above reasons to be eligible for asylum.

Additionally, the INA gives the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security the power to grant or deny asylum. Section 1158(b)(1)(A) states that,

The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General may grant asylum to an alien who has applied for asylum in accordance with the requirements and procedures established by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General under this section if the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General determines that such alien is a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A).

4. The Refugee Act of 1980

The Refugee Act of 1980 was “the first major change in United States immigration law that attempted to address the realities of modern refugee problems by articulating a national policy and providing mechanisms that

---

156. Id.
157. Id.
158. Id.
159. Id.
160. Id.
161. Id.
162. Id.
are capable of adapting to changing world events and policies.” 163 The Refugee Act of 1980 updated the definition of “refugee” in accordance with the definition used in the United Nations Refugee Convention. 164 The Act modified the definition of “refugee” to include a person with a “well-founded fear of persecution.” 165 Under the Refugee Act, a “refugee” is defined as a person “who is outside his/her country of nationality or habitual residence”, or someone who is without any nationality, and is unable or unwilling to return to his or her homeland because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a social group or membership in a political group or party. 166

5. Matter of A-R-C-G-

In 2014, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) decided Matter of A-R-C-G-, the first case where the BIA issued a binding asylum decision for domestic violence victims. 167 In Matter of A-R-C-G-, the respondent was beaten and raped on multiple occasions by her husband in Guatemala. 168 Respondent contacted the Guatemalan police on several occasions but the police stated that they would not get involved in a marital relationship. 169 The court in Matter of A-R-C-G- held several pivotal holdings: (1) that the respondent suffered harm that rose to the level of persecution, (2) that the respondent was a member of a “particular social group”, and (3) that the persecution was because of her membership in the particular social group. 170 Domestic violence victims were viewed as a part of a particular social group because the members of the group share a common immutable characteristic: gender. 171 The BIA then remanded the case to the immigration judge to
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consider whether the government of Guatemala was unwilling or unable to remedy the situation. On remand, the immigration judge did not provide a reason “as to the Guatemalan’s government’s inability or unwillingness to protect the respondent from her abuser”; instead the judge granted asylum upon the stipulation among the parties.

6. Matter of A-B-

In 2018, Matter of A-B overruled the precedent set in Matter of A-R-C-G-. In Matter of A-B-, the respondent’s husband beat her, raped her and threatened to kill her on numerous occasions. She sought protection from the Salvadorian authorities, but they offered her no protection or remedy. The decision held that domestic violence victims are not part of a “particular social group” and the fact that a country has trouble policing domestic violence cannot itself establish asylum claims, reasoning that “a particular social group must ‘exist independently’ of the harm asserted in an application for asylum or statutory withholding of removal.” Further, the decision stated that if a group is defined by the persecution of its members, then the group’s definition extinguishes the need to establish actual persecution. For this reason, the individuals in the group must share a characteristic narrower than their risk of persecution. Furthermore, defining a particular social group in a way that seeks to avoid issues of social particularity by having a narrow definition—for example, Guatemalan women who are unable to leave their domestic relationship where they have children in common—will lack sufficient social distinction to be a distinct social group.

7. Grace v. Whitaker

In 2018, a group of plaintiffs appealed a decision denying their asylum based on a decision determined in Matter of A-B-; in Grace v. Whitaker consisted of twelve adults and children expressed accounts of sexual abuse,
The plaintiffs were denied the right to seek asylum although the asylum officer found their accounts sincere. The decision of the asylum officer was based on the standard set forth in Matter of A-B-, which denies asylum to victims of domestic violence because they are not a protected class. The plaintiffs brought this action against the Attorney General arguing that he violated the Immigration and Nationality Act because the Matter of A-B- standard created an unlawful and arbitrary heightened standard for domestic violence victims.

In Matter of A-B-, the court stated the general rule that if a domestic violence victim claims “asylum based on membership in a particular social group, then officers must factor the [standards explained in Matter of A-B-] into their determination of whether an applicant has a credible fear or reasonable fear of persecution.” The court in Grace v. Whitaker held this general rule violated the Immigration and Nationality act for two reasons: first, “the general rule is arbitrary and capricious because there is no legal basis for an effective categorical ban on domestic violence victims;” and second, “a general rule runs contrary to the individualized analysis required by the INA.” Under current immigration laws, the credible fear interviewer must prepare a case-specific factually intensive analysis for each individual.

A general rule that bars asylum seekers based on the category of their abuse is “inconsistent with congress’s intent to bring United States refugee law into conformance with the protocol” and with congress’ intent to read “[a] particular social group” broadly. Consequently, the court further noted that, “in interpreting particular social group in a way that results in a general rule, in violation of the requirements of the statute, the Attorney General ha[d] failed to stay within the bounds of his statutory authority.”

181. Id. at 104–05.
182. Id. at 105.
183. Id.
184. Id. at 126.
185. Id.
186. Id.
187. Id. at 126 (citing INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 436–37 U.S. (1987)).
188. Id. (citing Dist. of Columbia v. Dep’t of Labor, 819 F.3d. 444, 449 (D.C. Cir. 2016)).
Furthermore, the district court addressed the validity of the former Attorney General Sessions’ ruling in Matter of A-B. The district court held that it had exclusive jurisdiction to review challenges to the validity of the expedited removal system. Such systemic challenges include challenges to the constitutionality of any provision of the expedited removal statute. The district court also included challenges claiming that a given regulation or written policy directive, guideline, or procedure is inconsistent with the law.

In Matter of A-B, the court identified specific guidelines for asylum cases, and stated that these guidelines were “clearly a written policy directive.” Therefore, sufficient cause existed to challenge the validity of the case.

8. Refugee Protection Act of 2019

In 2019, Senator Patrick Leahy and Representative Zoe Lofgren led the bicameral introduction of the Refugee Protection Act of 2019. The Act provides for asylum laws that take into consideration domestic violence victims by indicating that these victims may seek asylum. Section 206(c)(5), addressing Refugees of Special Humanitarian Concern, states:

[i]n this section, the term “refugee of special humanitarian concern to the United States” means any individual who, in his or her country of nationality has suffered (or in the case of an individual who remains in his or her country of nationality, has a well-founded fear of suffering)

(A) domestic, sexual, or other forms of gender-based violence, including forced marriage and persecution based on sexual orientation or gender identity.


While waiting to hear a decision from the immigration court or asylum application, asylum seekers may be placed in detention centers. “United States law distinguishes between three different types of asylum-seekers: affirmative asylum-seekers who are not in removal proceedings;
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defensive asylum seekers who seek asylum in removal proceedings before an immigration judge, and asylum seekers who enter the United States without proper documents and are subject to expedited removal.  

All three types of asylum seekers may be detained under certain conditions. All types of asylum seekers are often detained once they have been denied asylum or have overstayed after their visas expired. Additionally, asylum seekers claiming asylum at a United States’ port of entries, or after entering the United States without proper documents, are automatically detained pending an interview to determine if they have a credible fear of persecution. If the interviewer finds that the asylum seeker does not have a credible fear of being persecuted in their home country, they are detained and subject to removal. Asylum seekers who are found to have a credible fear can be released, however, they are often detained until an immigration judge makes a decision about their asylum status.

Healthcare standards are in place at detention centers for women but they are rarely enforced, and they do not take into consideration gender sensitive measures for those have endured domestic violence. The United States Immigrant Customs and Enforcement’s (ICE) health care standards provide some expected outcomes, such as appropriate gynecological and obstetrical health care; pregnancy services, including prenatal care and pregnancy testing; and deterrence of ICE officials from restraining pregnant detainees.

While the ICE health care protocol portrays values of care for human life and health, the reality is that individuals at detention centers are subject to less stringent standards of health care while in custody: the medical treatment provided to detainees is often inadequate, and medical staff are often overworked or under qualified. Furthermore, because the financial penalties from the Bureau of Prisons for privately-run detention centers
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are so low, paying the penalty for not complying with standards can be less costly than trying to meet the medical standard.\textsuperscript{206}

\textbf{E. Canada Law}

The Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) lays out the immigration laws of Canada\textsuperscript{207} and case law dictates the outcome of domestic violence victims who are seeking asylum.

\textit{1. The Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA)}

The United Nation’s refugee’s definition has been adopted by Canadian law,\textsuperscript{208} in Division 1 section 96 of the IRPA:

\begin{quote}
A Convention refugee is a person who, by reason of a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion, \\
(a) is outside each of their countries of nationality and is unable or, by reason of that fear, unwilling to avail themself of the protection of each of those countries; or \\
(b) not having a country of nationality, is outside the country of their former habitual residence and is unable or, by reason of that fear, unwilling to return to that country.\textsuperscript{209}
\end{quote}

\textit{2. Narvaez v. Canada}

In \textit{Narvaez v. Canada}, the female applicant from Ecuador had suffered consistent verbal and physical abuse, including rape, by her husband during their marriage and after separation.\textsuperscript{210} She sought protection with the police, but her complaint was erased from the record after her husband bribed the police.\textsuperscript{211} Her initial application was denied, but then reversed after appealing to a federal court it was ultimately held that women in Ecuador who have been subjected to domestic violence belong to a particular social group and Narvaez was granted asylum.\textsuperscript{212}
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In 2012 CanLII 94152, the female applicant suffered abuse by her husband for many years. She sought protection from the Guyanese police on five separate occasions, and every time, the Guyanese police arrested her husband, gave him a verbal warning, and held him overnight. However, he was never charged with a crime. The Immigration and Refugee Board found that while the female applicant was part of a particular social group, she had not presented clear and convincing evidence that the Guyanese authorities did not reasonably try to protect her. She was denied asylum because she did not meet the standard to be a Convention refugee.


In Narvaez v. Canada, the female applicant ultimately received asylum because she not only was able to show that she was a victim of domestic violence but also that the Ecuadorian police did not provide her with any form of protection. In 2012 CanLII 94152, even though the female applicant was a victim of domestic violence, she was unable to prove that the Guyanese police were not willing to protect her because the Guyanese police had taken some measures to reprimand her husband. Canada’s immigration proceedings are very stringent: to be eligible to seek asylum based on domestic violence, the applicant must be able to prove both that they were victim of domestic violence and that the police in their country were unable to provide them with protection.

214. Id. at para. 4.
215. Id.
216. Id.
217. Id. at paras. 19–20.
218. Id.
220. 2012 CanLII 94152 (Can.).
III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

In order to find a better solution for domestic violence victims seeking asylum in the United States, this section will provide an overview of the positive and negative attributes of Sweden’s, Germany’s, and Canada’s asylum laws. It will then conclude by providing judicial and legislative suggestions on how to improve the United States’ asylum laws by incorporating international asylum laws.

A. Sweden

Sweden’s asylum laws adopted the 1951 Refugee Convention and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Sweden recognizes women who are domestic violence victims as part of a particular social group and thus eligible for asylum. In addition to domestic laws, Sweden’s immigration laws are regulated by the European Union’s Common European Asylum System and the Istanbul Convention, both of which include provisions to protect women who are domestic violence victims.

Recently, Sweden has been impacted with a huge influx of asylum seekers. Sweden’s 2018 asylum policy proposed changes to its previous asylum policies and called for stricter policies and global responsibility-sharing in order to help the economic state of the country, which has struggled due to the high influx of asylum seekers and other immigration patterns. Even though Sweden has recognized women who are domestic violence victims as part of a particular social group and have given them the right to be granted asylum, the process nonetheless has been very difficult due to the huge influx of asylum seekers in Sweden.

Sweden has signed and ratified the Istanbul Convention, which states in Article 60 that: (1) parties to the convention must provide the legislative framework to recognize gender-based violence as a ground for persecution within the meaning of Article 1 of the 1951 Refugee Convention; (2) a
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gender sensitive interpretation must be given by states to all the other grounds of Article 1; and (3) states must develop gender sensitive reception procedures and support services for asylum seekers.229 Some of the actions Sweden has taken to implement parts 1 and 2 of Article 60230 of the Istanbul Convention include doubling the Swedish Migration Agency’s staff from 4,000 to 8,000 staff members and requiring the employees to complete gender based violence training in their introductory training programs.231 However, despite the Swedish Migration Agency’s acknowledgement of the need for protection of refugee and asylum seeking female domestic violence victims, Sweden has not yet reached the level of the European Union’s protection standards.232

Sweden has tried to remedy the high influx of asylum seekers by taking a global responsibility approach instead of creating a policy that halts asylum seekers from seeking asylum.233 By taking this approach, Sweden has taken a humanitarian stance and has tried to find an alternative to the crisis. Women who are fleeing their country in fear of their abusers are given the opportunity to seek asylum and are not denied that fundamental right.234 At a minimum, the United States should adopt and follow the approach Sweden has taken toward domestic violence victims who are seeking asylum and give them the opportunity to seek asylum. Further, the United States should try to find a remedy for the high influx of asylum seekers instead of finding ways to prohibit and restrict the number of asylum seekers.

B. Germany

In the summer of 2015, Germany accepted 1.4 million asylum seekers.235 During that summer, Chancellor Merkel adopted an open door policy,
meaning that Germany allowed asylum seekers and immigrants to freely enter into the country. However, due to the high influx of individuals seeking asylum and the community blaming the increase of high crimes rates on immigrants, the government established transit centers in order to return asylum seekers to the countries where they had originally sought asylum. When that is not possible, Germany has agreed to send the asylum seekers back across the border to Austria, the entry point of a significant number of migrants. These drastic changes to Germany’s open door policy may contradict the open and humanitarian approach that Germany has taken in the past. Since 2005, persecution based on gender had been routinely recognized as grounds for asylum in Germany. Sadly however, in practice, this type of persecution has been less and less taken into account.

Germany has also adopted the Istanbul Convention which states that gender sensitive accommodations should be provided in reception centers. However, in reality, the German reception centers lack any private space for individuals or families. Additionally, many individuals staying in these reception centers face depression, assault, and abuse, making these centers unsafe places, where asylum seekers who are in need of gender sensitive accommodations are not given the treatment and attention they need.

Even though Germany’s asylum laws are becoming increasingly stricter, Germany still recognizes that domestic violence victims are members of a particular social group and it grants them the opportunity to apply for asylum.

Furthermore, Germany has found a solution to address the high influx of immigrants by creating a system that sends back asylum seekers who
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had originally sought asylum in another country. This solution has allowed Germany to address the influx of asylum seekers, but altogether, it has disallowed asylum seekers from seeking asylum and protection from their abusers.

The United States should adopt in its Constitution a convention similar to the Istanbul Convention. Moreover, the United States should go one step further than Germany and ensure that the convention’s standards are implemented into the detention centers. By recognizing this right, the United States will be more in line with the United Nation’s standard of protection for women seeking asylum.

C. Canada

Due to the United States’ comparatively more stringent asylum laws, Canada is facing an influx of immigrants. Under Canadian law, women victims of domestic violence are recognized as a “particular social group” and they are given the opportunity to apply for asylum. However, while Canada recognizes domestic violence victims as being a part of a particular social group in fear of persecution, the Canadian courts have adopted heightened standards as to what qualifies as a government unwilling to provide protection to domestic violence victims.

In evaluating asylum applications, Canada considers evidence of a lack of police cooperation in a victims’ home country. A mere delay in protection will not suffice as proof that the police or government is not helping them seek safety from their abuser. For example, in 2012 CanLII 94152, a Guyanese female applicant who suffered abuse by her husband was denied

asylum because the local police had intervened, gave the abuser verbal warnings, had arrested him, and kept him over night on various occasions. Because the police had intervened, though ineffective, it showed that the government made an effort to help her therefore, the court denied her application for asylum. Although applying stringent standards, Canada still allows for domestic violence victims to seek asylum; it thus properly follows the standards set out by the United Nations and the human rights standards.

The United States should adopt a similar standard; it could help address the high influx of asylum seekers. Such heightened standards on who would qualify for asylum could potentially lower the number of individuals applying, without putting a ban on all domestic violence victims seeking asylum.

IV. PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION FOR THE UNITED STATES ASYLUM LAWS

The United States, through the decision in Matter of A-B-, stated that domestic violence victims are no longer a particular social group cannot seek asylum in the United States based on this ground. Then in Grace v. Whitaker, the court held that the decision in Matter of A-B- was inconsistent because the standards went against the INA and that there was no legal basis for an effective categorical ban on domestic violence victims. The holding in Grace v. Whitaker better conforms to Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which the United States is a party to, and asserts that everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy asylum from persecution. In denying women who are domestic violence victims the right to seek asylum from their persecutors, the holding in Matter of A-B is denying women their basic human rights.

The United States has a high number of applicants who are coming to the United States with the hopes of seeking asylum. In an effort to remedy
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the high influx of asylum seekers, the United States attempted to ban and to deny all domestic violence victims the ability to apply for asylum. However, the ruling in *Grace v. Whitaker* once again gave domestic violence victims the chance to apply for asylum. Even though domestic violence victims now have the ability to apply for asylum, the United States still has not recognized domestic violence as a particular social group. *Grace v. Whitaker* only recognized that there is no legal basis for an effective categorical ban on domestic violence victims presenting themselves at the border but it did not recognize domestic violence victims as part of a particular social group.

The United States should adopt laws similar to Canada's, where women who are domestic violence victims are recognized as part of a particular social group. Altogether not recognizing women who are domestic violence victims as a particular social group in fear of persecution does not provide a gender sensitive interpretation of what it means to be a member of a particular social group.

Unlike the European Union, the United States is not a part of a union where it can rely on other countries to share and manage the huge influx of immigration. But it could potentially adopt an immigration policy similar to Sweden’s 2018 immigration policy, which implements stricter policies and aims to create methods to share global responsibilities with neighboring countries.

In addition to recognizing domestic violence victims as a particular social group, the United States should create a legislative framework similar to the Istanbul Convention. Recently, the United States proposed a Refugee Protection Act, in 2019, that recognizes domestic violence victims as persons who qualify for asylum. However, this Act does not provide a framework
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that takes into consideration gender sensitive interpretation of the particular social group.\textsuperscript{265} Therefore, the United States would benefit from adopting a law similar to the Istanbul Convention.

By adopting laws similar to the Istanbul Convention, the new legislation could provide a legal framework that recognizes “gender based violence as a grounds for persecution,” provide “gender sensitive” interpretations of membership in particular social groups, and “develop gender sensitive reception procedures and support services for asylum seekers.”\textsuperscript{266} Currently, those seeking asylum in the United States and those who are waiting for their applications to be processed face detention, and only some of them are allowed to live in the United States.\textsuperscript{267} Similarly to those detained in Sweden and Germany, those who are detained in the United States experience harsh living conditions, such as housing with individuals convicted of criminal offenses, inappropriate and excessive physical restraint, and inadequate access to healthcare.\textsuperscript{268} Creating a law similar to the Istanbul Convention would not only provide a legal framework that would recognize gender based violence and provide gender sensitive perspectives, but also provide services that protect the well-being of victims and offer remedies to victims in detention or reception centers.

\textit{A. Legislative Recommendations}

The INA lays out who is eligible for asylum, the exceptions to eligibility, and who is responsible for deciding eligibility.\textsuperscript{269} The INA requires, among other criteria, that an individual’s life must be “threatened on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.”\textsuperscript{270} This language was adopted from the United Nations 1951 Refugee Convention, Article I, which states individuals should be granted asylum if they are:

[A person] owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a
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nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.\(^{271}\)

However, the INA is written in the negative, stating that an individual will not be eligible to receive asylum if:

> [the] alien’s life or freedom would not be threatened on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, and where the alien would have access to a full and fair procedure for determining a claim to asylum or equivalent temporary protection, unless the Attorney General finds that it is in the public interest for the alien to receive asylum in the United States.\(^{272}\)

While the INA essentially states that asylum should be given to those who are in fear of persecution, the Act should mirror the positive language used in the United Nations 1951 Refugee Convention which more clearly reflects international standards of human rights. Additionally, the Act should incorporate the following ideals from the Istanbul Convention that state that parties to the Convention must (1) provide a legislative framework that recognizes gender based violence as a ground for persecution within the meaning of Article 1 of the 1951 Refugee Convention; (2) provide a gender sensitive interpretation of all the other grounds of Article 1, e.g., membership of a social group; and (3) develop gender sensitive reception procedures and support services for asylum seekers.\(^{273}\) By incorporating the ideals from the Istanbul Convention the United States will be better suited to help women who are domestic violence victims.

The proposed Refugee Protection Act of 2019 should incorporate the following:

1. Individuals shall be given the right to apply for asylum if they are in fear of persecution due to their race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, and the government in their country of origin has not afforded them protection.
   a. Those who suffer domestic violence victims or victims of violence should be recognized for purposes of this section.

\(^{271}\) The 1951 Refugee Convention, supra note 19, at 14.

\(^{272}\) § 1158.

\(^{273}\) EUR. PARLIAMENT, supra note 12, at 9.
b. “Particular social group” shall be defined as mass groups of people who endure similar experiences globally.

2. Additionally, those who are persecuted based on gender should be recognized as a particular social group and should be eligible for asylum based on this ground.
   a. Gender-sensitive policies must be adopted and followed in reception and detention centers, and in particular when dealing with victims of abuse.
   b. Domestic violence training should be provided to employees who work at ICE detention centers in order to provide the best care for those who are victims of domestic abuse.

Furthermore, in addition to amending the INA, the United States should follow in the steps of Germany and incorporate a right to asylum into the United States Constitution. The article to the United States Constitution should be as follows: An individual persecuted on political grounds shall have the right to asylum. Political grounds shall be defined as individuals in fear of persecution due to his/her race, religion, nationality, gender, membership in a particular social group or political opinion, and the government of his/her country has not afforded them protection. The term particular social group shall include mass groups of people who endure similar experiences globally.

B. Judicial Recommendations

In the United States, immigration courts are not a part of the federal court system but rather they are a part of homeland security, subject to the attorney general. The fact that immigration courts are not a part of the judicial branch creates situations where the appointed judge may not be impartial. Impartial judges can ameliorate the potential for biased decisions.

Additionally, the courts should adopt a standard similar to Canada. The courts in Canada have recognized that domestic violence victims are part of a particular social group and have heightened requirements in place to determine whether their home country is providing protection from the

abuser.277 By adopting a similar approach to Canadian courts, the United States would have a systematic judicial procedure for accepting and denying domestic violence asylum seekers. By incorporating the legislative change provided above, the United States courts should adopt a standard similar to the Canadian court’s procedure. The judicial standards that should be implemented are as follows:

1. The victim must be a part of a particular social group:
   a. Particular social groups include domestic violence victims.
   b. The asylum applicant must provide proof that they are a part of the particular social group by providing the courts with evidence of abuse.
2. The victim must prove that his or her home country’s government failed to provide he or she with protection.
   a. This standard should be given more weight.
   b. The government has not failed to provide protection if the government has aided or helped the victim. However, the government has failed to provide protection if the government did not help the victim because of lack of resources or authority or the government was not able to provide the best protection.

If the domestic violence victim is unable to provide evidence of abuse by her abuser, asylum should not be granted. Additionally, if the domestic violence victim is unable to prove that the government failed to provide protection from his or her abusers, the domestic violence victim will not be granted asylum.

By adopting these recommendations, the United States will be able to classify domestic violence victims as part of a particular social group. The United States government will be able to meet its goal in reducing the amount of asylum seekers in the United States by imposing heightened standards that would deter those who do not meet the requirements. The United States will be able to provide relief and remedy for those domestic violence victims who are in need of protection, thereby adopting a judicial system that provides a humanitarian approach.
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V. CONCLUSION

United States’ asylum laws are currently unstable. Although current case law, following Grace v. Whitaker, provides domestic violence victims with a chance to apply for asylum, the Trump administration has appealed and a new decision in opposition of asylum seekers is pending. The denial of asylum will lead to deportation back to places where these victims will endure not only psychological and mental injury but also continuous abuse that could lead to serious injury or even death. This Comment proposes that given the current instability of the United States law on asylum for domestic violence victims, the United States should take on a more global and humanitarian role in order to protect women who are domestic violence victims.

Former Attorney General Session’s approach towards victims of violence seeking asylum was extreme. It had completely eliminated the possibility of a domestic violence victim from receiving asylum in the United States. The holding in Grace v. Whitaker has re-opened a window to allow domestic violence victims to be granted asylum. However, the chances of appeal and further changes in legislation could lead to negative impacts on domestic violence asylum: the future is unclear. By adopting provisions similar to the Istanbul Convention, the United States could create procedures and regulations for domestic violence victims that better protect them, while still maintaining its policy considerations and concerns.

These changes would put the United States in alignment with the United Nations asylum standards which establishes an individual’s right to claim asylum on the basis of gender-based persecution and crimes. By taking a more humanitarian approach, not only will domestic violence victims’ benefit, but society as a whole will benefit. Creating an atmosphere where compassion and kindness are afforded to other individuals will generate a society in the United States that promotes diversity and inclusion for all. Furthermore, if the United States were to take this type of approach, Tatiana Burbano who was mentioned at the beginning of this Comment and who escaped her abusive husband, could feel as if she had reached a safe harbor in the United States, and she would be protected and be able to live a life free of torment and abuse.