

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

D2



Date: **JUL 26 2011** Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE:

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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

*Michael T. Kelly*  
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.

On the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner stated that it is a “comprehensive ocular (eye) medical practice. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as an ophthalmic associate position, 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 two independent grounds, namely, that the petitioner had failed to establish that (1) the proffered position meets the definition of a specialty occupation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), and (2) the beneficiary is qualified to serve in a specialty occupation in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C).

Counsel submitted a Form I-290B appeal in this matter. The body of the appeal reads, in its entirety:

1. The California Service Center incorrectly found that the position of an Ophthalmic Associate is not a specialty occupation under the Immigration and Nationality Act and therefore erroneously denied the petitioner’s H-1B petition.
2. The California Service Center incorrectly found that the beneficiary would be required to establish that she possessed a permanent or temporary license to practice as an optometrist for the position of an Ophthalmic Associate in the State of Nevada and therefore erroneously denied the petitioner’s H-1B petition.

Counsel also 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.

Counsel’s statement on appeal contains no specific assignment of error. Alleging, directly or indirectly, that the director erred in some broad or 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, therefore, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

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