




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

C-1



File: [REDACTED] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUL 9 2004

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:




Petition: Immigrant Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), as described at Section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C)

IN 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

identity tag data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
disclosure of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a church. It seeks to classify the beneficiary as a special immigrant religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4). The director denied the petition on September 10, 2003.

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.”

The Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, filed on October 14, 2003, indicates the following reason for appeal: “We believe we can provide additional documentation to allow BCIS to approve this case.”

The petitioner indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. To date, nine months later, review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision.

As the statement submitted by the petitioner on appeal does not make any detailed assertion referring specific errors fact or conclusions of law made by the director, the petitioner has failed to overcome the findings of the director. Moreover, in the absence of any allegation detailing specific errors of law or fact, we cannot find that the petitioner’s submission qualifies as a substantive appeal.

Accordingly, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.