


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



D-2

FILE: SRC 05 249 51690 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: **AUG 06 2007**

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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:

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.

*Robert P. Wiemann*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
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 non-profit adult educational foundation. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a management analyst, and endeavors to classify her 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).

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. The director determined that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation. In particular, the director determined that, despite the director's request for more specific information as to the work that the beneficiary would actually perform, the petitioner failed to specifically describe the tasks to be performed by the beneficiary on a daily basis in the petitioner's business environment. As such, the director determined that the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position qualified as a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the petition was denied.

On appeal, the petitioner indicated on the Form I-290B that a brief would be filed within 30 days supporting the appeal. To date, no brief has been filed and the record is deemed complete. The director denied the petition stating that the proffered position did not qualify as a specialty occupation. The petitioner states on the Form I-290B that the position qualifies as a specialty occupation and the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* supports that conclusion. The petitioner does not otherwise address the basis of the director's decision. The petitioner has failed to specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact upon which the appeal is based. The appellant must do more than simply file an appeal. It must clearly demonstrate the basis for the appeal. This, the appellant has failed to do. As such, the appeal must be dismissed.

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.