

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY



CI

FILE:



Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JUL 22 2005

SRC 05 252 55244

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:



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.

Mari Johnson

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) 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 (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), to perform services as a youth worship minister. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been engaged continuously in a qualifying religious vocation or occupation for two full years immediately preceding the filing of the petition, that the position qualified as that of a religious worker, that the petitioner had the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage, or that it had extended a qualifying job offer to the beneficiary.

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a letter, in which it appeared to ask for an unspecified period of time in which to submit an appeal. However, on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Unit, the petitioner did not indicate that it needed additional time in which to submit a brief or additional evidence. In fact, the petitioner indicated that a brief and/or additional evidence accompanied the appeal. The petitioner stated on the Form I-290B that it believed it could provide what was needed for approval of the petition. Nonetheless, as of the date of this decision, more than sixty days after the appeal was filed, no further documentation has been received by the AAO. Therefore, the record will be considered complete as presently constituted.

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.

The petitioner has failed to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding; therefore, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.