

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



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

PUBLIC COPY



B2

FILE: EAC 03 212 50071 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: JUL 05 2005

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
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.

Mai Johnson

S Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

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 that the petitioner had not established the sustained national or international acclaim requisite to classification as an alien of extraordinary ability.

On her Form I-290B, the petitioner stated:

Applicant herein will prove that she is an alien with extraordinary abilities, and has been in the international world of Judo Associations. With trophies and medals received here in Puerto Rico, U.S.A., during recent years, and has maintained such status here in New York City, since arrival date – March 8, 1989. More time is needed to construct extraordinary-abilities into an application for permanent residency.

The petitioner dated her appeal December 17, 2004 and indicated that she would send a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days. On January 15, 2005, CIS received a letter from the petitioner requesting an additional 30 days to submit a brief and/or evidence. As of this date, over six months later, the AAO has received nothing further from the petitioner.

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 here has identified no errors of law or fact in the decision denying her petition. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.