


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



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

**PUBLIC COPY**



BC

FILE:

EAC 04 120 50541

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER


Date:

**JUN 21 2006**

IN RE:


Petitioner:

Beneficiary:



PETITION: Immigrant petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Acting Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the preference visa petition that is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a concrete foundation construction company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a concrete construction supervisor. The acting director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition and denied the petition accordingly.

Counsel submitted a Form I-290B appeal in this matter. In the section reserved for the reason for filing the appeal, counsel inserted, "To demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the date of filing."

On the form appeal counsel indicated that he would provide a brief or evidence within 30 days. No brief or evidence was submitted, either with the form appeal or subsequently. On April 6, 2006 this office sent counsel a facsimile transmission asking whether he had submitted any such information, argument, or documentation.

Counsel responded with a letter dated April 12, 2006. In that letter counsel stated that no brief or additional evidence had been submitted.

Counsel's statement on appeal contains no specific assignment of error. Alleging that the acting director erred in some unspecified way is an insufficient basis for an appeal.

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."

Counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal and the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.