

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. A3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services


D7

**PUBLIC COPY**




File: SRC 04 026 52404 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: JUL 03 2007

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:



**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 Director, Texas Service Center, denied the petition for a nonimmigrant visa. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant visa petition seeking to extend the employment of the beneficiary in the position of executive as an L-1A nonimmigrant intracompany transferee pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). The petitioner is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Texas and is allegedly engaged in the printing business.

The director originally denied the petition on April 20, 2004 as abandoned because the petitioner failed to respond to the director's Request for Evidence. The petitioner subsequently moved to reopen the proceeding claiming that a timely response had been submitted. On May 20, 2004, the director reopened the matter but denied the petition concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary would be employed in a primarily executive or managerial capacity. On June 17, 2004, the petitioner again moved to reopen and reconsider, and, on July 8, 2004, the director reaffirmed her denial of the petition. The petitioner then filed an appeal. The director declined to treat this appeal as a motion and forwarded the appeal to the AAO for review.

A review of Citizenship and Immigration Services records indicates that this beneficiary is also the beneficiary of an approved immigrant petition and has adjusted status to that of a permanent resident on June 17, 2005. While the petitioner has not withdrawn the appeal in this proceeding, it would appear that the beneficiary is presently a permanent resident and the issues in this proceeding are moot. Therefore, this appeal is dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed as moot.