




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
protect privacy and prevent
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY




D7

DATE: **APR 02 2012** Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER FILE:

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)

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,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will summarily dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant petition seeking to classify the beneficiary as an L-1A nonimmigrant intracompany transferee pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). The petitioner is a New Jersey limited liability company engaged in the wholesale distribution of beverages. It claims to be an affiliate of [REDACTED]. The petitioner has employed the beneficiary as its executive manager since 2005 and now seeks to extend his L-1A status for two additional years.

The director denied the petition concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary will be employed in a primarily managerial or executive capacity under the extended petition.

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. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the beneficiary "spends a lot of his time in managerial duties" despite the small size of the U.S. company. Counsel asserts that the petitioner "will show that there is evidence to support the position and duties of the exceptional manager."

Counsel indicated that she would submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days of filing the appeal. Counsel filed the appeal on July 19, 2010. As of this date, the AAO has not received counsel's brief or any additional evidence in support of the appeal, and the record will be considered complete.

To establish eligibility for the L-1 nonimmigrant visa classification, the petitioner must meet the criteria outlined in section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Act. Specifically, a qualifying organization must have employed the beneficiary in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity, or in a specialized knowledge capacity, for one continuous year within three years preceding the beneficiary's application for admission into the United States. In addition, 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.

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.

Upon review, the AAO concurs with the director's decision and affirms the denial of the petition. Counsel's brief statement on the Form I-290B does not identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact on the part of the director as a basis for the appeal. Counsel's general objections to the denial of the petition, without specifically identifying any errors on the part of the director, are simply insufficient to overcome the well-founded and logical conclusions the director reached based on the evidence submitted by the petitioner. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter Of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). As noted above, counsel has not submitted a brief or evidence to further articulate the basis for the appeal.

Contrary to counsel's assertions, the record as presently constituted does not include sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the beneficiary "spends a lot of his time in managerial duties." Rather, as noted by the director, the record lacks any detailed description of the beneficiary's actual duties and includes inconsistent information regarding the number of employees and/or contractors working for the company and their job duties. The director's decision addressed these and other evidentiary deficiencies in detail. Counsel fails to acknowledge, much less resolve, the inconsistencies and deficiencies discussed in the denial.

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. Inasmuch as the petitioner has not identified specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in support of the appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.