

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

PUBLIC COPY



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**



85

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: JAN 07 2011

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The 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 restaurant that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a wine steward trainee pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(iii) for the period from March 2, 2009 until March 2, 2011.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the director's RFE; (4) the director's denial letter; and, (5) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner submitted the Form I-290B on March 4, 2010. The petitioner marked the box at Part 2 of the Form I-290B to indicate that a brief and/or evidence would be sent within 30 days. The appeal brief was never received by the AAO. Thus, the AAO deems the record 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). The only new document submitted on appeal is the Form I-290B submitted by the petitioner, which states the following:

India's wine market has been expanding at about 30% each year since 1999. France is the largest exporter to India with Australia and California following. Here at [the petitioner] we learn about French, Australian and United States wines. Australian Shiraz is growing in interest while U.S. wines are now of French status. Upon completion of his time here [the beneficiary] will be knowledgeable in the placement of U.S. wines upon his return to India.

The petitioner fails to identify specifically how the grounds of the director's decision are based upon an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact. In this instance, the petitioner has not specifically identified as a basis for the appeal, nor has the AAO found, an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in the director's decision. Under these circumstances, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal. 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).

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed. The petition is denied.