



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

01



FILE: [REDACTED]
SRC 06 014 51590

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: JUL 11 2007

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), as described at Section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C)

ON 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
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part, “[a]n 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 the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, filed on December 7, 2006, counsel indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. To date, more than seven months later, careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision. On June 13, 2007, the AAO sent counsel a fax message in order to ascertain whether or not counsel had submitted the brief. The AAO allowed counsel five business days to respond. To date, the record contains no response from counsel and the AAO considers the record to be complete as it now stands.

On appeal, counsel generally states that the director’s decision was incorrect. Counsel then argues that the appeal is timely, and that more time is needed to supplement the appeal. However, as stated above, no brief was submitted to supplement the appeal. Accordingly, the appeal contains no substantive discussion at all of the stated grounds for denial.

Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.