

**Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

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




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**




CA

FILE:   
EAC 01 173 53677

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER


Date: MAY 25 2005

IN RE: Petitioner: 

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:



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*

*RP* Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**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 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 literature evangelist. 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 he asserted that the director erred in denying the petition because the petitioner had submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the beneficiary is a religious worker within the meaning of the statute and regulation. Counsel indicated on the Form I-290B that he would submit a brief and/or other evidence within 30 days of filing the appeal. As of the date of this decision, more than nine 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 fact 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.