

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



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

PUBLIC COPY

61

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **MAY 02 2006**
EAC 03 005 50864

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter 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 (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), to perform services as a “religious teacher for youth.” The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary’s position qualifies as a religious occupation.

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 October 25, 2004, counsel indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. The record contains no subsequent submission, and in response to a query by the AAO, counsel has confirmed that no brief was submitted.

The statement on the appeal form reads simply “We believe that the Service’s decision is inaccurate and the case is approvable. Therefore, we would like the AAO to review this case again.” This is a general statement that makes no specific allegation of error. The bare assertion that the director somehow erred in rendering the decision, and that the petitioner desires appellate review, is not sufficient basis for a substantive appeal.

Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.