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

(b)(6)

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

DATE: AUG 2 6 2014 OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at http://www.uscis.gov/forms for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements.** *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a Buddhist temple. It 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 an abbot's assistant. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had the required two years of continuous, qualifying work experience immediately preceding the filing date of the petition. The director also found that the petitioner failed to establish how it intends to compensate the beneficiary.

The petitioner does not provide a statement with the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, that specifically identifies an erroneous conclusion of law or fact in the decision being appealed. Instead, in an April 28, 2014 letter, the petitioner states that the beneficiary has many years of experience and that the petitioner has a need for his services, and requests reconsideration of our decision. The petitioner submits additional letters expressing support for the beneficiary and discussing non-salaried compensation and the activities of the beneficiary and the petitioning temple. In addition, the petitioner submits copies of flyers, photographs, and two bank statements. However, the petitioner offers no explanation regarding how the submitted evidence demonstrates error on the part of the director or overcomes the director's grounds for denying the petition.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) provides that an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. The petitioner has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial. The submission of additional documents with no argument relating to error provides no substantive basis for the filing of the appeal. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.