



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

B6

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: WAC 99 152 53279

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: JAN 18 2001

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



Public Copy

Identifying data removed to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which 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 which 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 Service 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 which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Mary C. Mulrean, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based preference immigrant visa petition was denied by the director, California Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a Filipino restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a chef. As required by statute, the petition was accompanied by an individual labor certification from the Department of Labor. The director determined the petitioner had not established that it had the financial ability to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage as of June 12, 1995, the filing date of the visa petition.

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, counsel for the petitioner indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. Careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other evidence in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision.

The statement on the appeal form reads simply "Petitioner maintains it had the ability to pay the preferred wage to the beneficiary, at the time the priority date was established, and has such ability presently. Petitioner will submit a brief and additional evidence in support of this appeal within 30 days." These statements make no specific allegation of error and, therefore, they are not sufficient basis for a substantive appeal.

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.

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.