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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

D9

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

[redacted]

FILE: WAC 05 217 50096 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAR 07 2006

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiaries:

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(P)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(P)(i)

ON 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.

Mari Johnson

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner seeks classification of the beneficiaries as employment-based nonimmigrants pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(P)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(P)(i), as internationally recognized entertainers, in order to employ the beneficiaries in the United States for a period of one year. The beneficiary [redacted] is a 45-year old native and citizen of Argentina. The beneficiary is a 73-year old native and citizen of Argentina.

The director denied the petition, in part, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiaries were internationally recognized entertainers.

On appeal, the petitioner submitted additional evidence and failed to state a reason for the appeal. All but one item of the evidence submitted on appeal was not translated. Because the petitioner failed to submit certified translations of the documents, the AAO cannot determine whether the evidence supports the petitioner's claims. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3) states: "*Translations:* Any document containing a foreign language submitted to the Service shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified is complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English."Accordingly, the evidence is not probative and will not be accorded any weight in this proceeding.

The petitioner failed to address specifically the grounds for denial set forth in the decision of the director.

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 any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

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

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.