

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529-2090
Mail Stop 2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

C₁

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: NOV 24 2008
WAC 07 221 53848

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.

JF Grissom
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 (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a Buddhist society. 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 monk. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it qualified as a bona fide nonprofit religious organization. The director further determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been a member of the petitioner's denomination and had been engaged continuously in a qualifying religious vocation or occupation for two full years immediately preceding the filing of the petition, that it has extended a qualifying job offer to the beneficiary, and that the petitioner had the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage.

The petitioner timely filed a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, in which it stated that due to a misunderstanding caused by language barriers, "the original request for supporting information was not fully addressed." The petitioner stated that supplemental information had been gathered for the appeal, and indicated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted within 30 days of filing the appeal. As of the date of this decision, however, more than 11 months 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.