

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

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

[REDACTED]

D7

DATE: **APR 23 2012** Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER [REDACTED]

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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:

[REDACTED]

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, California 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 visa petition seeking to classify the beneficiary as an L-1B intracompany transferee with 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 petitioner is a corporation established in the Philippines. It seeks to transfer the beneficiary to its claimed U.S. branch, [REDACTED] a California limited liability company established in November 2009. The petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary in the position of executive business evaluator in the new U.S. office for a period of one year.

The director denied the petition on April 15, 2010, citing two independent and alternative grounds for denial. Specifically, the director determined that the petitioner failed to establish: (1) that the beneficiary possesses specialized knowledge or that she would be employed in the United States in a position that requires specialized knowledge; and (2) that the United States and foreign entities have a qualifying relationship.

The petitioner filed a timely appeal on May 17, 2010. The director declined to treat the appeal as a motion and forwarded the appeal to the AAO for review. On appeal, counsel provides a brief statement on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion. Counsel indicated he would submit a brief and/or additional evidence to the AAO within 30 days. 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 fails to identify with specificity any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact as a basis for the appeal. Further, counsel's statement fails to acknowledge both grounds of denial as he does not address the director's determination that the petitioner did not submit evidence to establish the existence of qualifying relationship between the United States and foreign entities.

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). 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 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).

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.