

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



B6

File:  Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 07 2006
WAC 03 209 53304

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:



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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3) as a skilled worker. The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary has the requisite experience as stated on the labor certification application and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel indicated that he would submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days and stated the following: the beneficiary possesses the minimum requirements as stated in Form ETA 750 Parts 14 and 15, and the beneficiary has two (2) years of prior work experience as a butcher. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel do not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

Counsel dated the appeal December 30, 2004. As of this date, more than 17 months later, the AAO has received nothing further. The AAO sent a fax to counsel on May 11, 2006 informing counsel that no separate brief and/or evidence was received to confirm whether or not he would send anything else in this matter, and as a courtesy, providing him with five days to respond. To date, nearly four weeks later, no reply has been received.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Counsel here has not specifically identified any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal and has not provided any additional evidence. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.