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

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

[redacted]

B6

MAY 0 4 2004

FILE: [redacted] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

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]

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 immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director of the Texas Service Center and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner indicates that it is a subsidiary related to the Seventh-Day Adventist Church. It 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 him as a "literature evangelist." The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the proffered position qualified as a religious vocation or occupation. The director also determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been engaged continuously in a qualifying religious vocation or occupation for two full years immediately preceding the filing date of the petition. The director also determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary was qualified as a religious worker. The director further determined that the petitioner had not established that it has had the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage. Finally, the director determined that the petitioner had not established that it is a bona fide non-profit religious organization.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director erred in denying the petition. Counsel further asserts that the material previously submitted in response to the director's request for additional evidence is sufficient to demonstrate eligibility for the benefit sought.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v):

> 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 has failed to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. Nor has counsel submitted any additional evidence to overcome the grounds for denial of the petition. Therefore, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.