





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




DATE: JUN 06 2013 OFFICE: CALIFORNIA 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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,



Ron Rosenberg
Acting 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 appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant petition seeking to employ the beneficiary as a 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, a Washington corporation, states that it operates as a distributor of transport chairs. The petitioner claims to be an affiliate of [REDACTED]. The petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary as its "VP of Marketing, Product and Business Development" for a period of three years.

On March 10, 2013, the director denied the petition on two separate grounds, concluding that the petitioner failed to establish: (1) that the beneficiary has been employed abroad in a position that was managerial, executive, or involved specialized knowledge; and (2) that the petitioner will employ the beneficiary in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity.

On April 8, 2013, counsel for the petitioner submitted the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, to appeal the denial of the underlying petition. The director declined to treat the appeal as a motion and forwarded the appeal to the AAO for review. Counsel for the petitioner marked the box at part two of the Form I-290B to indicate that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. The record indicates that the petitioner did not file a brief or supplemental evidence within the allowed timeframe. The AAO will consider the record complete as presently constituted.

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 the 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.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner simply states:

The USCIS erred as a matter of law denying [REDACTED] L-1A petition for Mr. [REDACTED]. The decision does not substantially evaluate the evidence that was submitted and is

- completely against the weight of evidence. As such, the decision is an abuse of discretion and should be reversed.

Neither counsel nor the petitioner has specifically identified 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 are insufficient to overcome the well-founded conclusions the director reached based on the evidence submitted by the petitioner. The unsupported 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).

Upon review, the AAO agrees with the director's decision and will affirm the denial of the petition. As no erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact has been specifically identified and as no additional evidence is presented 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, the petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.