

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

[REDACTED]

B4

DATE: **AUG 10 2012**

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

[REDACTED]

IN RE:

[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:

[REDACTED]

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 engaged in the fabric and textile wholesale business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as its President. 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 June 7, 2010, the director denied the immigrant petition concluding that petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary's proposed employment with the U.S. entity are within a qualifying managerial or executive capacity.

On July 7, 2010, counsel for the petitioner submitted the Form I-290B to appeal the director's denial. Counsel marked the box at part two of the Form I-290B to indicate that the brief and/or additional evidence will be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. The appeal brief was never received by the AAO, thus, the AAO deems the record complete and ready for adjudication.

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).

In regards to the director's conclusion that the petitioner failed to submit sufficient evidence to show the beneficiary's eligibility for the immigrant petition, the petitioner fails to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. Counsel contends that the denial was arbitrary and capricious but fails to provide supporting documentation to corroborate this claim. Counsel stated that the immigrant visa petition should be approved but did not provide any supporting evidence. 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).

Counsel suggests that the director's adjudication of the petition was unfair. The petitioner has not demonstrated any error by the director in conducting his review of the petition. Nor has the petitioner demonstrated any resultant prejudice such as would constitute a due process violation. *See Vides-Vides v. INS*, 783 F.2d 1463, 1469-70 (9th Cir. 1986); *Nicholas v. INS*, 590 F.2d 802, 809-10 (9th Cir. 1979); *Martin-Mendoza v. INS*, 499 F.2d 918, 922 (9th Cir. 1974), *cert. denied*, 419 U.S. 1113 (1975).

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.