

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent identity misappropriation  
violation of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

57




File: SRC 02 132 53804 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: 007 7

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


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:



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

The petitioner seeks to extend the employment of its president/director as a nonimmigrant manager or executive pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). The director determined that the petitioner had failed to show that the beneficiary was employed by the U.S. entity in a primarily managerial or executive capacity as compelled by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(1)(3)(ii).

On appeal, counsel states that he would be submitting a separate brief and/or evidence to the Administrative Appeals Office within 30 days of the filing of the appeal. Counsel states on the Form I-290B that Citizenship and Immigrations Services (CIS) “improperly denied the extension of the previously approved L1 visa filed by the appellant for the beneficiary,” but fails to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact. Instead, counsel briefly asserts that the beneficiary is in fact a manager as evidenced by the documents previously submitted prior to adjudication.

The appeal was received at CIS on February 18, 2003. More than one year has passed since the filing of the appeal, yet as of the date of this decision, the AAO has received nothing further.

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 filing by an attorney of an appeal that is summarily dismissed under this section may constitute frivolous behavior as defined in 8 C.F.R. § 292.3(a)(15).

Counsel here has not addressed the reasons stated for the denial and has not provided any additional evidence. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.