



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identified as being related to
prevent...
invasion of personal privacy

PHOTOCOPY



[Handwritten signature]
MAY 25 2005

File: 
SRC 03 258 50442

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date:

IN RE: Petitioner:
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:

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

S Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas 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, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), to perform services as a minister. The petition was denied on June 4, 2004.

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 June 28, 2004, the petitioner indicated that it was submitting a brief and/or separate evidence within 30 days. The petitioner lists the following as the reason for the appeal: “We would like to submit additional evidence regarding this case.”

The petitioner does not assert that any of the director’s findings are incorrect or based upon an erroneous conclusion of law or policy. Further, despite the passage of nearly 11 months, the petitioner has not submitted any additional evidence.

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

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.