

**PUBLIC COPY**

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

**B4**

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

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE  
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F  
425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20536



File: WAC 02 058 53639

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: DEC 9 - 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



**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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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 employment-based visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a corporation organized in July 1996 in the State of California. It imports and exports molybdenum products and other nonferrous metals. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as its vice-president. Accordingly, it endeavors to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C), as a multinational executive or manager. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been or would be employed in a managerial or executive capacity for the petitioner.

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

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.

Counsel for the petitioner submitted a Notice of Appeal, Form I-290B that was received by CIS on July 5, 2002. Counsel indicated he would send a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days. To date, more than one year later, the AAO has not received a brief or other evidence in support of the petitioner's appeal. The I-290B states:

[CIS] failed to give proper weight to [the beneficiary's] detailed duties and responsibilities, illustrated with examples, as an executive. It denied his I-140 petition based solely on the grounds that his duties were not executive in nature. A proper analysis of the complex duties and responsibilities show [the beneficiary] qualifies for an approval.

Counsel's assertion that the beneficiary qualifies as an executive is not sufficient. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Counsel does not specify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact made by the director on the issue of the beneficiary's managerial or executive capacity. Inasmuch as the basis for the appeal is not specifically delineated, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.