

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
Office of Administrative Appeals
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D2



FILE: EAC 09 143 50325 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 30 2010

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



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

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. 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 \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a landscaping and facilities maintenance company which seeks to employ the beneficiary as an operations manager. Thus, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). The director denied the petition, finding that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate that the proffered position met the definition of a specialty occupation.

Counsel submitted a timely Form I-290B on December 11, 2009 and indicated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. As of this date, however, the AAO has not received any additional evidence into the record. Therefore, the record is complete.

The director provided a detailed analysis and specifically cited the deficiencies in the evidence in the course of the denial. Counsel's statement on form I-290B, which simply states that the "petitioner shall provide supplemental brief and/or additional evidence within 30 days to AAO," does not specifically identify any errors on the part of the director and is therefore insufficient to overcome the well-founded and logical conclusions the director reached based on the evidence submitted by the petitioner.

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). Counsel fails to specify how the director made any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the petition. As neither the petitioner nor counsel presents additional evidence 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).

The burden of proof in this proceeding 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.