



DY

U.S. Department of Justice  
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy


OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
U.I.L.B., 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: EAC-01-010-50325 Office: Vermont Service Center Date:

JAN 15 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



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

PUBLIC COPY

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner manufactures shoes, industrial machinery and electronic "goods" and sells shoes, chemicals, electronic equipment, live stock and marine products. It seeks to employ the beneficiary temporarily in the United States as its quality design and assurance manager. The director determined that the petitioner had not identified a specific beneficiary as required by the L-1B petition, that the petitioner had not established that a beneficiary would be employed in the United States in a specialized knowledge capacity, or that the U.S. business would support a specialized knowledge employee within one year.

On appeal, the petitioner states that he was not aware that he must submit a petition for only one executive or manager and that he is now submitting an L-1B petition for one individual who could train other employees.

8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

*Summary dismissal.* 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.

On appeal, the petitioner acknowledges that the initial petition was misfiled, agreeing with the decision of the director in that regard. In fact, the petitioner fails to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. The petitioner does not submit a brief or otherwise address the issues of specialized knowledge or the business plan cited by the director in his decision. The evidence that was submitted on appeal, a new petition, is not sufficient to overcome the decision of the director. The appeal will, therefore, be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(v).

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely 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.