




B4

U.S. Department of Justice  
Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536

Identification data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



File: WAC 00 023 50195 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: 9 APR 2002

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

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(C)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:  
[Redacted]

Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which 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 which 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 Service 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 which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

*Myra L. Rosenberg*  
for Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director of the California Service Center denied the immigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(v).

The petitioner is a California corporation that exports goods to Japan and runs a Japanese restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as its manager of export and restaurant operations and, therefore, endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a multinational executive or manager pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(C).

The director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to establish that the foreign entity employed the beneficiary in an executive or managerial capacity for at least one year in the three years immediately preceding the beneficiary's entry into the United States as a nonimmigrant.

Counsel submitted a timely Form I-290B on January 7, 2001 and indicated that a separate brief or evidence would not be submitted. Counsel stated on the form that:

The reason for this appeal is that Hayato Terada [the beneficiary] was judged to have have [sic] met all the requirements of E-2 visa at the time his E-2 visa was approved and issued to him and therefore, he should be considered qualified for permanent resident visa on that basis in the category of multinational executive or manager.

8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

*Summary dismissal.* 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 for the appeal.

On the Form I-290B, counsel fails to specify how the director made any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the petition. As neither the petitioner nor counsel presents additional evidence on appeal to overcome the decision of the director, the appeal will be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(v).

The burden of proof in this proceeding rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.