

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

C1



FILE:

WAC 06 275 53242

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: DEC 08 2008

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)

ON 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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

  
John F. Grissom, Acting Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based 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 dismissed.

On appeal, counsel generally asserts that the director erred. Counsel did not elaborate on his argument, cite to specific errors on the part of the director or specifically address any of the director's findings. Further, despite counsel's assertion that he would submit a brief to the AAO within 30 days, to date, no submission has been received. Accordingly, the record is considered to be complete as it now stands.

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.

Counsel's general statement regarding the director's decision is not sufficient to meet the requirements for filing a substantive appeal. Therefore, as the petitioner has failed to specifically identify an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.