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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

C1

FILE: [redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: JAN 0 4 2005
EAC 02 002 50760

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

PETITION: 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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

PUBLIC COPY

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

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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

The petitioner is a church. It seeks to classify the beneficiary as a 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), to perform services as a religious instructor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the position qualified as that of a religious worker.

Counsel for the petitioner timely filed a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Unit, in which counsel asserted that the petitioner wished to clarify the beneficiary's qualifications and to submit additional evidence. Counsel indicated on the Form I-290B that a brief and/or additional evidence would be forwarded to the AAO within 30 days. As of the date of this decision, more than 16 months after the appeal was filed, no further documentation has been received by the AAO. Therefore, the record will be considered complete as presently constituted.

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 ft for the appeal.

The petitioner has failed to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding; therefore, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.