U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

File: [redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: AUG 25 2004

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), as described at Section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

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 employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary as a special immigrant religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4). The director denied the petition on April 17, 2003.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part, "[a]n 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."

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, filed on May 15, 2003 counsel states:

> The decision of the [sic] Director should be reviewed for the following reasons:
>
> 1. All the documents requested by your office were mailed on February 28, 2003.
> 2. The requested documents were included [sic] Training Certificates and Employment Letters for the beneficiary. These documents proved that the beneficiary is a bonafide religious worker and were sufficient to approve I-360 petition.

Counsel also indicated that a separate brief and/or evidence was not being submitted.

Counsel's general statement fails to refute any of the findings stated by the director in his decision. Further, counsel does not specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law, statement of fact, or Citizenship and Immigration Services' (CIS) policy.

We note that in his decision, the director specifically noted receipt of the additional documents submitted by the petitioner in response to the director's request. The director states:

> You were requested to submit evidence that the alien has the required two years of full-time experience in the religious, vocation, professional religious work, or other religious work for the period immediately prior to the date of filing this petition. The evidence submitted does not clearly establish that the alien has been working as a religious worker for the two years immediately preceding the filing of the petition.

The director went on to specifically discuss each of the petitioner's evidentiary submissions and detail the reasons for finding the petitioner's documentation did not establish the beneficiary's qualification for the classification, such as the fact that the evidence failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary was continuously employed on a full-time basis in a traditional religious occupation for the two years immediately preceding the filing of the petition, that the beneficiary was compensated for his services, and that the beneficiary received specific religious training.

Counsel's statement on appeal does not specifically address any of the detailed findings made by the district director. Further, the petitioner does not assert any specific claim that the director's findings are incorrect or

based on an erroneous conclusion of law or CIS policy. In the absence of any allegation detailing specific errors made by the director, we cannot find that the petitioner's submission qualifies as a substantive appeal.

Accordingly, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.