


PUBLIC COPY

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

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

BY

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



NOV 10 2003

FILE: [REDACTED] OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER DATE:

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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:  
[REDACTED]


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 California Service Center initially approved the employment-based preference visa petition. Subsequently, the beneficiary applied for adjustment of status. After further review of the record, the director concluded that an error was made in approving the petition. The director, therefore, properly served the petitioner with a Notice of Intent to Revoke on May 10, 2002, and he ultimately revoked the petition's approval on July 15, 2002. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1)(v).

The petitioner is a California corporation that seeks to employ the beneficiary as its president. 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 revoked approval of the petition because the proffered position is not in a managerial or executive capacity.

Counsel submitted a timely Form I-290B on July 30, 2002, indicating that a separate brief and/or evidence would be submitted to the Administrative Appeals Office within 30 days. On September 3, 2002, the Administrative Appeals Office received a letter from counsel requesting an additional two weeks to submit a brief. As of this date, however, the record does not contain a 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 states that the director "erroneously misapplied the law." However, counsel fails to specify how the director made an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact. As neither counsel nor the petitioner 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.