



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: 11/17/11

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:

[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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont 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 an assistant to the pastor. 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. The director also determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary was qualified for a religious worker position within the religious organization, or that the position qualified as that of a religious worker. The director further determined that the petitioner had not established that it had extended a valid job offer to the beneficiary.

Counsel for the petitioner timely filed a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Unit, in which counsel asserted that the service center erred in denying this petition. Counsel indicated on the Form I-290B that she was submitting a separate brief and/or additional evidence, however 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.

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

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.