

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY




D7

FILE: WAC 08 047 50624 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **AUG 27 2008**

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)

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California 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 states that it is engaged in IT services, namely back offices and call center services. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant intracompany transferee with specialized knowledge pursuant to § 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(L). The director denied the petition based on the conclusion that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary possessed specialized knowledge or that he would be employed in a capacity involving specialized knowledge.

On the Notice of Appeal received on April 21, 2008, counsel for the petitioner clearly indicates that he would send a brief with the necessary evidence to the AAO within thirty days. Specifically, counsel states: "The petitioner is in the process of acquiring additional documents to establish grounds for the appeal. As such, we respectfully request the Service Center to grant additional 30 days to submit an appeal." Counsel's general statement fails to specifically identify any errors on the part of the director.

Although counsel requested additional time to submit an appeal, to date there is no indication that the petitioner or counsel ever submitted a brief and/or evidence in support of the appeal with the Service or with the AAO.¹ As stated above, absent a clear statement, brief and/or evidence to the contrary, the petitioner does not identify, specifically, an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact. Hence, the appeal must be summarily dismissed. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) state, in pertinent part:

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.

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. Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the petitioner has not sustained that burden. Therefore, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed

¹ On August 12, 2008, the AAO sent a fax to counsel. The fax advised counsel that no evidence or brief had been received in this matter and requested that counsel submit a copy of the brief and/or additional evidence, if in fact such evidence had been submitted, within five business days. As of the date of this decision, the AAO has received no response from counsel or the petitioner.