

**PUBLIC COPY**



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

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

C1

[Redacted]

FILE: [Redacted]  
WAC 03 119 53814

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUL 28 2004

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

PETITION: 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)

ON 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

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

The petitioner seeks classification of the beneficiary as a 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), in order to employ him as a fulltime staff member.

As the beneficiary signed the Form I-360 petition, the beneficiary will be treated as the self-petitioner of the petition for a special immigrant visa.

The director denied the petition, finding that the petitioner had failed to establish that the church is a qualifying organization, that the petitioner had been continuously carrying on a religious vocation or occupation for at least the two years preceding the filing of the petition, and the church's ability to pay the proffered wage.

On appeal, the petitioner indicated that he would submit a brief and/or additional evidence to the AAO within thirty days of filing the appeal. More than six months have lapsed since the appeal was filed and nothing more has been submitted to the record.

The petitioner failed to address specifically the grounds for denial set forth in the decision of the director.

The regulation at 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.

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.