

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Da



FILE: LIN 03 170 53568 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: **JUL 23 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
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a hotel that seeks to employ the beneficiary as an accountant. The petitioner 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 denied the petition on the basis that the proffered position did not meet the definition of a specialty occupation.

Counsel submitted a timely Form I-290B on September 29, 2003 and indicated that no additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO; therefore, the record is complete.

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 fails to specify how the director made any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the petition. Counsel reiterates assertions made in the petitioner's response to the request for evidence. Counsel also states that the director's decision is inconsistent with numerous other, unspecified decisions. As neither the petitioner nor counsel, however, 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.