C1

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Citizenship and Immigration Services

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
425 I Street, N. W.
Washington, DC 20536

[redacted]

File: [redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 15 2003

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

Petition: 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:

[redacted]

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision 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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks classification of the beneficiary as a 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), in order to employ her as a "Stephen Minister/Caregiver."

The director denied the petition finding that the evidence of record was not sufficient in establishing that the position offered constitutes a qualifying religious occupation, or that the petitioning organization tendered a qualifying job offer.

On appeal, counsel argues that the position offered is a religious position, and that the petitioning organization has tendered a qualifying job offer. Counsel requests an additional 30 days, on or before October 13, 2002, to submit a brief, as she is pregnant and is having "difficulty concentrating on what I am doing." To date, no additional information or evidence has been received.

As no additional information has been provided in support of the appeal, the record must be considered complete.

Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3 (a)(1)(v) state, in pertinent part:

> *Summary dismissal.* 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 expresses disagreement with the decision of the director, but fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. As the petitioner has provided no additional evidence on appeal to overcome the decision of the director, the appeal is dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed