



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

CA



File: [Redacted] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: [Redacted]

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)

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.

Mari Johnson

for Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

RECEIVED
SEP 10 2010
TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary 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 November 26, 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.”

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, filed on December 24, 2003, the petitioner, through counsel, indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. To date, eight months later, careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision.

The statement on the appeal form reads:

- 1) Immigration Service erred in denying the petition because it ignored the submitted evidence and explanation which have proven that the beneficiary was eligible for the classification.
- 2) New information just became available and these evidence, which will clearly provide further support to the petition and will prove that the petition warrants a favorable consideration.

Counsel, in his statement, attempts to refute the director’s finding in the most general way. Counsel does not provide any authority to argue that there is a question of law and fails to discuss particular details to dispute any of the director’s factual findings. Counsel’s scant language providing the grounds for appeal does not satisfy the regulation.

We note that the record contains a letter dated February 4, 2004, indicating counsel’s withdrawal of his appearance. No future submissions or arguments have been made by the petitioner to support the appeal.

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.