




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

b2



FILE: [Redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **MAY 03 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: SELF-REPRESENTED

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 instant nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner describes itself as a nonprofit. In order to employ the beneficiary as an IT assistant, the petitioner seeks 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, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition on the basis that the petitioner had failed to establish that the proffered position meets the definition of a specialty occupation as set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The petitioner submitted a Form I-290B appeal in this matter. In the section reserved for the reason for filing the appeal, the petitioner inserted, "The decision determining that the position is not a specialty occupation is erroneous. A brief and supporting documentation explaining the petitioner's position will be submitted separately." On appeal, the petitioner checked Box B in Part 2 of Form I-290B to indicate that a brief or additional evidence, or both, would be submitted within 30 days. No brief or evidence was submitted to the AAO, either with the form appeal or subsequently.

The petitioner's statement on appeal contains no specific assignment of error. Alleging, directly or indirectly, that the 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."

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

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