

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



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

07

File: LIN 05 135 52653 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 04 2007

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



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

IN 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.


Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant visa petition seeking to employ the beneficiary as its trade director to open a new office in the United States as an L-1B nonimmigrant intracompany transferee having specialized knowledge pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). The director denied the petition concluding that the petitioner did not establish that the beneficiary has been or will be employed in a capacity involving specialized knowledge.

The petitioner subsequently filed an appeal. The director declined to treat the appeal as a motion and forwarded the appeal to the AAO for review. In support of the appeal, counsel to the petitioner provided the following in a statement on the Form I-290B: "Dispute Service Interpretation of 'specialized knowledge.'" Counsel also indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be sent to the AAO within thirty days.¹

To establish eligibility under section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Act, the petitioner must meet certain criteria. Specifically, within three years preceding the beneficiary's application for admission into the United States, a firm, corporation, or other legal entity, or an affiliate or subsidiary thereof, must have employed the beneficiary for one continuous year. Furthermore, the beneficiary must seek to enter the United States temporarily to continue rendering his or her services to the same employer or a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a managerial, executive, or specialized knowledge capacity.

Upon review, the AAO concurs with the director's decision and affirms the denial of the petition.

Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) state, 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.

As counsel has failed to specifically identify any erroneous conclusions of law or statements of fact made by the director in denying the petition, the appeal must be summarily dismissed. While counsel indicated that he disputes the director's interpretation of specialized knowledge, counsel failed to explain why he believes that the director's interpretation was erroneous.

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. The petitioner has not met this burden.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.

¹On April 30, 2007, the AAO sent a fax to counsel. The fax advised counsel that no evidence or brief had ever been received in this matter and requested that counsel submit a copy of the brief and/or additional evidence, if in fact such evidence had been submitted, within five business days. As of the date of the decision, the AAO has not received a response to its fax. Therefore, the record will be considered complete.