

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE:

EAC 05 205 50048

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JUL 31 2007

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)

ON 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 preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is an auto repair/transmissions business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an auto mechanic. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition, and denied the petition accordingly.

Counsel submitted a Form I-290B appeal in this matter. In the section reserved for the basis of the appeal, counsel asserted that the director erred in her finding that the petitioner did not have the ability to pay the proffered wage since the petitioner's assets establish that it had the ability to pay the salary. Counsel did not submit a legal brief or additional evidence with the appeal.

Counsel selected on the appeal form filed March 7, 2006, the statement that indicated that counsel would be submitting a brief or additional evidence within 30 days. Further, counsel by his letter dated March 16, 2006, requested 30 days to submit a brief and additional supporting evidence. However, despite a request dated June 29, 2007, from the AAO for a brief and/or additional evidence from counsel, none was submitted.

Counsel's statement on appeal contains no specific assignment of error. Alleging that the director erred in some unspecified way is an insufficient basis for an 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."

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

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.