

**PUBLIC COPY**

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

*ca*

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20536



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**



File: LIN 02 155 51859      Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER      Date: **JUL 22 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:

**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

**DISCUSSION:** Approval of the employment-based immigrant visa petition was revoked by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal.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 properly served the petitioner with a notice of intent to revoke the approval of the petition under 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(b) and subsequently exercised his discretion to revoke approval of the petition under section 205 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1155, on November 4, 2003.

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, filed on December 5, 2003, the petitioner indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be forthcoming within thirty days. To date, seven months later, careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision.

The statement on the appeal form reads: “The denial is based on a misunderstanding of the beneficiaries [sic] response to the Service inquiries. A brief will be submitted within 30 days.”

As the petitioner makes no claim that any of the director’s findings are incorrect or based on an erroneous conclusion of fact, law, or Citizenship and Immigration Services policy, the petitioner has failed to overcome the specific findings of the director. In the absence of any allegation detailing specific errors of fact or law made by the director, 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.