

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**



B4.

DATE: **AUG 15 2012** OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER 

IN RE: Petitioner: 
Beneficiary: 

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a Florida corporation that is engaged in real estate development. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as its President and General 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.

On November 24, 2009, the director denied the immigrant petition concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary's proposed employment with the U.S. entity would be within a qualifying managerial or executive capacity. On December 28, 2009, the petitioner submitted the Form I-290B to appeal the director's denial. On appeal, the petitioner submits a one-page letter that states, "we consider there is enough evidence to proof [sic] that the beneficiary would be functioning primarily within the 'executive' or 'managerial capacities' as defined by the rules." The petitioner also states that it employs "more than 27 different companies" as subcontractors. Furthermore, the petitioner states that the beneficiary "uses his independent discretion and authority in identifying and cultivating new information sources, develop strong and mutually beneficial relationship with the different sub-contractors and other high level sources."

On appeal, the petitioner does not submit any additional evidence or documentation to corroborate the claim that it utilizes independent contractors. As noted in the director's decision, the petitioner only provided evidence of employing the beneficiary and one other employee. Although the petitioner provided a list of subcontractors, it failed to provide any evidence that the petitioner utilizes the subcontractors such as paystubs, Form 1099, contracts or invoices. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm'r 1972)).

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. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

The petitioner fails to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. As no additional evidence is presented on appeal to overcome the decision of the director, the appeal will be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.