U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

D7

File: [redacted] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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: 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner seeks classification of the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant intracompany transferee with specialized knowledge pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). The director denied the petition concluding that (1) the beneficiary did not meet the requirements of an intracompany transferee; (2) there was no qualifying relationship between the U.S. and foreign entities, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(3)(i); and (3) the U.S. and foreign entities have not been doing business as defined by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(1)(ii)(H).

On the appeal received on May 27, 2003, the petitioner states:

> I am asking for an appeal because I did not clearly state our request. We are not looking to transfer this applicant to the United States only to be able to send him from time to time to perform service based on the required specialized knowledge and application of our products. The length of each stay is specific to the nature of the job but would not exceed 2-3 days on a job at any one time after which he would return to Canada. Please let me know if I need to provide additional evidence to support this or any other claim. Your reconsideration of this application is appreciated.

The petitioner does not identify, specifically, any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact. 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 the petitioner 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.