



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B9

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

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: LIN 05 071 53266 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAR 07 2006

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

Mari Johnson

S Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Nebraska Service Center Acting 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 seeks classification of the beneficiary as an employment-based nonimmigrant pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(P)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(P)(i), as an internationally recognized athlete, in order to employ the beneficiary in the United States for an unspecified period of time. The beneficiary is a native and citizen of Ghana.

The director denied the petition, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary had achieved international recognition in his sport or that the beneficiary was coming to the United States to participate in an athletic competition which has a distinguished reputation and which requires the participation of internationally recognized athletes.

On appeal, the petitioner stated that he was very disappointed to hear that the petition had been denied and went on to explain the reason for the petition. Specifically, he wrote “[w]e are trying to build a bridge between the U.S. and Ghana in the boxing program. . . .we envision building championship caliber fighters that will compete on a professional and international level.”

The petitioner failed to address specifically the grounds for denial set forth in the decision of the director.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, 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.

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.