

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



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**


**PUBLIC COPY**



34


FILE: WAC 03 100 51934 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **APR 04 2005**

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:




PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to  
Section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(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, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner was incorporated in the year 2000 in the State of California. The petitioner is engaged in the retail of children's clothing, toys, books, and other accessories. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as its chief executive officer. Accordingly, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C), as a multinational executive or manager. The director denied the petition based on the determination that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary would be employed in a managerial or executive capacity.

Although the petitioner submitted an appeal, it was generally non-responsive to the director's concerns regarding the beneficiary's position and consisted of a single statement asserting that the denial "was based upon an incorrect application of law and Service policy." Nor further information is provided to expand on this generalized assertion. The petitioner indicated on its Form I-290B that it would not submit a separate brief or evidence. Accordingly, the record will be considered complete as currently constituted.

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.

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 counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the petitioner has not sustained that burden. Therefore, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.