



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



Dr

FILE: EAC 06 179 52809 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **AUG 01 2008**

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:

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

Information on the petition indicates that the petitioner is a software development business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to § 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 because the proffered position is not a specialty occupation.

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 I-290B, signed by the petitioner on July 24, 2007, the petitioner checked the block indicating that the petitioner would submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days. To date, no further documents have been received by the AAO.

On the Form I-290B, the petitioner fails to specify how the director made any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the petition. As the petitioner does not present 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.