

Identity information deleted to
protect your privacy
DIVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B4



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 03 2009
LIN 08 029 50702

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to
Section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).


John F. Grissom, Acting Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary as its sales manager. Accordingly, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C), as a multinational executive or manager. The director denied the petition based on three independent grounds of ineligibility: 1) the petitioner failed to establish that it has a qualifying relationship with the beneficiary's foreign employer; 2) the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary was employed abroad in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity; and 3) the petitioner failed to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in a managerial or executive capacity.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the director's denial was an abuse of discretion in light of an alleged typographical error in Part 2 of the petitioner's Form I-140, where the beneficiary's intended immigration classification was specified as that of a multinational manager or executive. Counsel does not, however, explain what the typographical error was specifically. In other words, counsel fails to explain how the beneficiary was intended to be classified, nor does he explain how the director was supposed to know that a typographical error had been made. It is not the director's responsibility to interpret the petitioner's submissions for typographical errors. Counsel also indicates his intent to submit a brief within 30 days of filing the appeal. To date, however, nine months since the appeal was filed, the record has not been supplemented with any additional evidence or information.

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.

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 counsel 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.