

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

*cl*

APR 18 2007

FILE:

EAC 04 262 53287

Office: VERMONT 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)

ON 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.

*Maura Deadnik*

*for* Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

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

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 April 3, 2006, the petitioner indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. To date, over a year 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 is a list of claims that the petitioner intended to prove on appeal, for instance: “To submit financial statements of the Church to show ability to pay income.” These are not arguments on appeal; rather, these are conclusions that the petitioner intended to draw from arguments to be made later. These general statements make no specific allegation of error. The claim that the petitioner will eventually establish the beneficiary’s eligibility is not sufficient basis for a substantive 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 appeal must be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.