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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

D7

[redacted]

NOV 16 2006

FILE: WAC 03 087 50129 Office: CALIFORNIA 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)

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
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 a new office engaging in the wholesale purchase of new automobiles. It seeks to employ the beneficiary temporarily in the United States as its executive manager and president, 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 the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary will be employed in a managerial or executive position in the U.S. entity. Specifically, the director noted that the organizational chart for the U.S. entity did not describe its managerial hierarchy and staffing levels, nor did it provide the names of all executive, managers, supervisors and number of employees under the beneficiary's supervision by name and title. The director further found that there is no indication in the evidence submitted by the petitioner that the beneficiary will exercise significant authority over generalized policy, or that the beneficiary's duties will be primarily managerial or executive in nature.

On the Form I-290B appeal, the petitioner simply states as the reason for appeal: "Evidence to demonstrate that the beneficiary will function, in a managerial and executive capacity." The petitioner included with the Form I-290B a new organizational chart and brief job descriptions purportedly for the employees of the U.S. entity, but did not submit a brief or any correspondence asserting any arguments on appeal.

To establish eligibility under section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Act, the petitioner must meet certain criteria. Specifically, within three years preceding the beneficiary's application for admission into the United States, a firm, corporation, or other legal entity, or an affiliate or subsidiary thereof, must have employed the beneficiary for one continuous year. Furthermore, the beneficiary must seek to enter the United States temporarily to continue rendering his or her services to the same employer or a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a managerial, executive, or specialized knowledge capacity.

Upon review, the AAO concurs with the director's decision and affirms the denial of the petition. The AAO notes that on March 15, 2003, the director had issued to the petitioner a comprehensive and detailed request for additional evidence. The petitioner was given nearly three months in which to submit the information requested. The regulation states that the petitioner shall submit additional evidence as the director, in his or her discretion, may deem necessary. The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8) and (12). The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

Where, as here, a petitioner has been put on notice of a deficiency in the evidence and has been given an opportunity to respond to that deficiency, the AAO will not accept evidence offered for the first time on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *see also Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). If the petitioner had wanted the submitted evidence to be considered, it should have submitted the documents in response to the director's request for evidence. *Id.* Under the circumstances, the AAO need not and does not consider the sufficiency of the evidence submitted on appeal.

Moreover, the 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.

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.

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. The petitioner has not met this burden.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.