

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B4



FILE: WAC 02 155 50910 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 22 2007

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a Delaware corporation that seeks to employ the beneficiary as its president and chief executive officer (CEO). 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) the proffered position is not in a managerial or executive capacity; and (2) no qualifying relationship exists between the petitioner and the alleged parent company in Canada.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a Form I-290B, indicating that it is not submitting a separate brief or evidence. The petitioner states simply:

We disagree that the position referred to in the petition is not of a managerial or executive capacity to qualify for the benefit sought.

We disagree on the ground that there is noqualifying [sic] business relationship between the petitioner . . . and the foreign company

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).

The petitioner's statements of disagreement with the director's decision are insufficient to satisfy the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v). The petitioner must do more than ask for appellate review of a denied petition; it must specify in the appeal how the director made an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the petition. As the petitioner fails to present any 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.