

PUBLIC COPY

**Identifying data omitted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

DM



FILE: SRC 01 194 50278 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: **APR 23 2004**

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)

IN 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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the petition for a nonimmigrant visa. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a Texas corporation that claims to be the subsidiary company of The [REDACTED] based in Pakistan. It seeks to extend its authorization to employ the beneficiary temporarily in the United States as its vice president. On March 14, 2002, the director determined that petitioner had not established that a qualifying relationship continues to exist between the United States company and the foreign entity. The director determined that the petitioner has not established that the foreign company is a viable entity which could send an intracompany transferee. Additionally, the director determined that the record does not establish that the beneficiary's duties in this position are primarily that of an executive or manager.

On the Form I-290B the petitioner stated that "The foreign and the United States entities are still qualifying [sic] status because they are doing business in regular and on continuous basis." The petitioner stated that additional information and brief would be submitted in 180 days. As of this date, more than one year later, the AAO has received nothing further in support of the appeal. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically and erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal is summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.