

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

D2



FILE: EAC 09 122 50218 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: APR 30 2010

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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:
[Redacted]

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, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director 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 corporation engaged in the software development and consulting business. To employ the beneficiary as a software developer, the petitioner seeks to classify him 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 on three independent grounds, namely, his determinations that the petitioner failed to (1) provide the itinerary required by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) when a proffered H-1B position is to be performed at more than one location; (2) provide a Labor Condition Application that corresponds to the petition; and (3) establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation as that term is defined by section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), and the implementing regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4).

On November 14, 2009 counsel for the petitioner submitted a Form I-290B (Notice of Appeal or Motion) without a brief or evidence. The only comment that counsel submits regarding the basis of the appeal is the following statement at Part 3 of the Form I-290B:

Decision was erroneous. Please see brief for details[.]

Although counsel checked box B at section 2 of the Form I-290B, indicating that he would send a brief and/or evidence within 30 days, the AAO has received neither. Accordingly, the record of proceeding is deemed complete as currently constituted.

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.