



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

**Non-Precedent Decision of the
Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 24303382

Date: MAR. 30, 2023

Appeal of California Service Center Decision

Form I-129, Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (L-1B Specialized Knowledge Worker)

The Petitioner, a manufacturing company, seeks to temporarily employ the Beneficiary as a cutting tool production technician under the L-1B nonimmigrant classification for intracompany transferees. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 101(a)(15)(L), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). The L-1B classification allows a corporation or other legal entity (including its affiliate or subsidiary) to transfer a qualifying foreign employee with “specialized knowledge” to work temporarily in the United States.

The Director of the California Service Center denied the petition, concluding that the record did not establish that: (1) the Beneficiary was qualified to perform the intended services in the United States; (2) the Beneficiary has been employed abroad in a position that was managerial, executive, or involved specialized knowledge; and (3) the U.S. position involves special knowledge or an advanced level of knowledge in the manufacturing field. The matter is now before us on appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). We review the questions in this matter de novo. *Matter of Christo’s, Inc.*, 26 I&N Dec. 537, 537 n.2 (AAO 2015). Upon de novo review, we will summarily dismiss the appeal.

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.”

The appeal includes a statement on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, in which the Petitioner briefly describes the Beneficiary’s claimed knowledge and experience. The Petitioner also notes that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services approved two other petitions that had been previously filed on behalf of employees in similar positions, and states that “[t]he evidence submitted is very similar in all three cases.” The statement, however, includes no substantive response to the grounds for denial described in the July 27, 2022 notice of decision.

Although the Director denied the petition on three specific grounds, the Petitioner does not acknowledge or specifically address these grounds, nor does it contest the Director’s ultimate decision.

As the Petitioner does not submit an appeal that identifies specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact relating to the three grounds for denying the petition, we are summarily dismissing the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed under 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).