identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 26 2004

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary: [redacted]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

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 employment based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary as an employment based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3), as a skilled worker or professional. The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a Mexican specialty cook. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing financial ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date of the visa petition.

On appeal, counsel states that he is requesting thirty days to send the petitioner's 2002 taxes and to gather more information relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay multiple employees. To date, no further evidence has been received. Therefore, the record must be considered complete as presently constituted.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(l)(v) provides in pertinent part that "[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."

In this case, the bare assertion that additional evidence is being sought is not a sufficient basis for a substantive appeal. It does not specifically address errors in the director's decision.

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

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.