



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

*Dr*



FILE: EAC 03 145 54266 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **AUG 04 2004**

IN RE: Petitioner:   
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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*

*60* Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**PUBLIC COPY**

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**DISCUSSION:** The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal shall be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a jewelry business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a market research analyst. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). The director determined that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation.

Counsel submitted a timely Form I-290B on August 19, 2003, and indicated that it was not submitting a separate brief or evidence.

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. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v). On the Form I-290B, counsel asserts that the duties of the proffered position are so specialized and complex as to require a baccalaureate degree, and that Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) has previously approved similar H-1B petitions. Beyond these limited remarks, counsel does not specify how the director made any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the petition. As neither the petitioner nor counsel presents additional evidence on appeal to overcome the decision of the director, the appeal will be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

The burden of proof in this proceeding rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.