

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: SEP 02 2004

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

[REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Alien of Extraordinary Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

Mari Johnson

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was initially approved by the Director, California Service Center. On the basis of further review of the record, the director determined that the petitioner was not eligible for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director properly served the petitioner with notice of intent to revoke the approval of the immigrant visa petition, and the reasons therefore, and ultimately revoked the approval of the petition on March 2, 2004. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

It is noted that the petitioner was initially represented by attorney Pnina R. Graff. The petitioner's appellate submission indicates that he is no longer represented by counsel.

The petitioner seeks classification as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A), as an alien of extraordinary ability. The director determined the petitioner had not established that he qualifies for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability.

On appeal, the petitioner states:

The decision of USCIS is erroneous and clearly without merit. The petitioner is "an alien of extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business or athletics," which has been proven by the evidence submitted by my former attorney, Ms. Pnina R. Graf.

As the USCIS is disputing practically every item of the evidence submitted, I must request at least 60 days (or in the alternative 45 days) to give me enough time to obtain...additional evidence...so that I can refute this decision.

The appellate submission was unaccompanied by arguments or evidence addressing the pertinent regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). The petitioner indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 45 to 60 days. The appeal was filed on March 22, 2004. As of this date, more than five months later, the AAO has received nothing further.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

The petitioner has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.