



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

C1



File: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: 9/11/2012

IN RE: Petitioner: [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)

IN 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

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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 summarily dismissed.

The petition was filed by a self-petitioner who seeks classification as a special immigrant religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4). The director denied the petition on September 13, 2003.

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.”

The Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, filed on September 29, 2003, indicates the following reason for appeal: “Unfavorable decision.”

As the statement submitted by the petitioner on appeal does not make any detailed assertion referring to specific errors fact or conclusions of law made by the director, the petitioner has failed to overcome the findings of the director. In the absence of any allegation detailing specific errors of law, fact, or Citizenship and Immigration Service’s policy, we cannot find that the petitioner’s submission qualifies as a substantive appeal.

Accordingly, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.