

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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

PUBLIC COPY



Dg

DATE: **DEC 15 2011**


Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

IN RE:


Petitioner:

Beneficiaries:



PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(P)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(P)(iii)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will summarily dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner filed the nonimmigrant petition seeking to classify the beneficiaries under section 101(a)(15)(P)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(P)(iii), as artists or entertainers coming to the United States to perform under a culturally unique program. The petitioner is self-described as a martial arts production company and seeks to employ the beneficiaries as martial artists for a period of one year.

The director denied the petition, concluding that the petitioner: (1) failed to demonstrate that the beneficiaries qualify as a culturally unique performance group or how the beneficiaries' area of expertise, Chinese kung fu, qualifies under the "arts" as defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(p)(3); and (2) failed to submit the required written consultation from an appropriate labor organization.¹

The petitioner subsequently filed an appeal. The director declined to treat the appeal as a motion and forwarded the appeal to the AAO for review. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner states: "The adjudicating officer erroneously denied this P-3 visa petition. Please refer to the original petition documents for details." Counsel indicated on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, that no supplemental brief or additional evidence would be submitted.

Section 101(a)(15)(P)(iii) of the Act, provides for classification of an alien having a foreign residence which the alien has no intention of abandoning who:

- (I) performs as an artist or entertainer, individually or as part of a group, or is an integral part of the performance of such a group, and
- (II) seeks to enter the United States temporarily and solely to perform, teach, or coach as a culturally unique artist or entertainer or with such a group under a commercial or noncommercial program that is culturally unique.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(p)(2)(ii) states that all petitions for P classification shall be accompanied by:

- (A) The evidence specified in the specific section of this part for the classification;
- (B) Copies of any written contracts between the petitioner and the alien beneficiary or, if there is no written contract, a summary of the terms of the oral agreement under which the alien(s) will be employed;
- (C) An explanation of the nature of the events or activities, the beginning and ending dates for the events or activities, and a copy of any itinerary for the events or activities; and

¹ The petitioner provided a consultation from the American Guild of Variety Artists (AGVA) on March 18, 2011, one day after the director issued the adverse decision. As the record contains evidence that the petitioner requested the consultation from AGVA prior to filing the petition in January 2011, the AAO will withdraw this ground for denial of the petition.

- (D) A written consultation from a labor organization.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(p)(6)(i) further provides:

- (A) A P-3 classification may be accorded to artists or entertainers, individually or as a group, coming to the United States for the purpose of developing, interpreting, representing, coaching, or teaching a unique or traditional ethnic, folk, cultural, musical, theatrical, or artistic performance or presentation.
- (B) The artist or entertainer must be coming to the United States to participate in a cultural event or events which will further the understanding or development of his or her art form. The program may be of a commercial or noncommercial nature.

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.

Upon review, the AAO concurs with the director's decision and affirms the denial of the petition. Counsel's general objection to the denial of the petition, without specifically identifying any errors on the part of the director, is simply insufficient to overcome the well-founded conclusions the director reached based on the evidence submitted by the petitioner. Counsel simply suggests that the petitioner previously submitted sufficient evidence of the beneficiary's eligibility, without acknowledging, much less attempting to resolve, the specific deficiencies which were discussed at some length in the director's decision. 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. 1998)(citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in support of the appeal, 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. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.