

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Citizenship and Immigration Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

B4



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



FILE: 

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

DATE: NOV 10 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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director of the Texas Service Center denied the immigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

The petitioner is a Georgia corporation that seeks to employ the beneficiary as its vice president of marketing and development. The petitioner, 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: (1) no qualifying relationship exists between the U.S. and Pakistani entities; (2) no qualifying foreign entity employed the beneficiary in a managerial or executive capacity for at least one year in the three years immediately preceding his entry into the United States as a nonimmigrant; (3) the proffered position is not in an executive or managerial capacity; (4) the petitioner does not have the ability to pay the proffered wage; (5) the Pakistani entity has not been doing business; and (6) the petitioner has not been doing business.

Counsel submitted a timely Form I-290B on June 24, 2002, indicating that a separate brief and/or evidence would be submitted to the Administrative Appeals Office within 60 days. As of this date, however, the record does not contain counsel's brief or any additional evidence. Therefore, the Administrative Appeals Office considers the record complete.

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss an appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

On the Form I-290B, counsel asserts that the director erred in denying the petition; however, counsel fails to specify how the director made an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact. 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.