

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

B9



FILE:



EAC 06 097 50616

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **JUL 21 2008**

IN RE:

Petitioner:



PETITION: Petition for Immigrant Abused Spouse Pursuant to Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii)

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.

2 Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part, “[a]n 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.”

On the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal, signed by counsel on February 7, 2007, counsel states the following as the reason for the appeal:

The Service erred in denying the petition that the evidence submitted was not sufficient to establish a good faith marriage. Additional evidence will be submitted within thirty days.

Counsel does not specify what the director’s purported errors were and does not refer to any specific issue to support his claim. Counsel’s general statement regarding the director’s error does not meet the requirements for the filing of a substantive appeal. Further, although counsel indicated that he would submit additional evidence within 30 days of the filing of the appeal, no further submission has been received. Accordingly, the record is considered to be complete as it now stands.

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulation mandates the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.