

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

[REDACTED]

File: [REDACTED]

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date:

NOV 20 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:
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 the Bureau 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, Texas Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner claims to be a corporation organized in the State of Florida in 1996. It claims to operate a retail store. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as its executive manager. Accordingly, the petitioner 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 director also determined that the petitioner had not established a qualifying relationship with the beneficiary's foreign employer. The director further determined that the petitioner had not established it was doing business as required by the regulations. The director also determined that the petitioner had not established its ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage. Finally, the director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been employed in a managerial or executive capacity for the foreign entity for one year prior to entering the United States as a nonimmigrant.

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 submitted Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, received by CIS on August 21, 2002. The Form I-290B contained the statement: "The adjudicating officer did not have sufficient information in order to make proper adjudication of this case." Counsel also attached a letter requesting an additional 55 days to submit a brief and/or evidence to support the appeal. To date, more than one year later, CIS has not received a brief or other evidence in support of the petitioner's appeal. Neither the Form I-290B nor the letter submitted on behalf of the petitioner identifies specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact as a basis for the appeal.

Inasmuch as the petitioner does not identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.



ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.