


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

27




FILE: SRC 02 215 50975 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 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)

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.


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

PUBLIC COPY

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

According to the documentary evidence contained in the record, the petitioner was incorporated in 2002 and claims to be in the business of designing, manufacturing, installing, and maintaining irrigation systems. The petitioner claims to be an affiliate of Representaciones Solo Agua, located in Ambato, Ecuador. The petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary in the United States as its manager. The director determined that the record was not persuasive in demonstrating that there was a qualifying relationship between the U.S. entity and the foreign entity. The director stated that although the record demonstrated that two shareholders owned shares in the foreign entity, there was no evidence to show what percentage of ownership each had. The director also stated that there had been no evidence submitted to demonstrate who owns the U.S. entity.

On appeal, counsel indicated that he would submit a brief or evidence to the AAO within 30 days. The notice of appeal is dated January 9, 2003. To date, the AAO has not received any additional evidence. Therefore, the record is considered complete.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(v) states in 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.

Counsel simply states in the Notice of Appeal that "both companies are owned by the same shareholders." As the petitioner has failed to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought 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 summarily dismissed.