

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B2



FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUN 24 2015

WAC 05 002 51020

IN RE:


Petitioner:



Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as Outstanding Professor or Researcher Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(B)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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 on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a laser manufacturer. It seeks to classify the beneficiary as an outstanding researcher pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(B). The petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an electronic engineer. The director determined that the petitioner had not established the significance of the beneficiary's research, or that the beneficiary is recognized internationally as outstanding in his academic field, as required for classification as an outstanding researcher.

On appeal, counsel merely stated that the director's decision "is unsound as beneficiary meets the criteria for EB1B classification." She indicated that she was "gathering information in response to denial" and that she would submit a brief and/or evidence to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) within 45 days. Counsel dated the appeal May 15, 2004. As of May 26, 2005, this office had received nothing further. Thus, on that date this office inquired of counsel as to whether she had submitted any supplemental materials. In response, she affirmed that she had not because the petitioner "elected to have the case reviewed on existing record."

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.

Counsel here has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence. She has merely expressed disagreement with the director's decision. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.