U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

C1

[redacted]

File: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 19 2008

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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)

IN 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.

Mari Johnson

for Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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 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, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4). The director denied the petition on October 24, 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 November 26, 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, "The Service decision was reached in error." Counsel, in her 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 sentence providing the grounds for appeal does not satisfy the regulation.

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.