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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

B5

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: JAN 21 2004

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

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.

Mari Johnson
for Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner seeks classification pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2), as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. At the time of filing, the petitioner was a doctoral student at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. The petitioner asserts that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer, and thus of a labor certification, is in the national interest of the United States. The director found that the petitioner qualifies for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, but that the petitioner has not established that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer would be in the national interest of the United States.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part, "[a]n 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 the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, filed on July 19, 1999, counsel indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. To date, over four years later, careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision.

On the appeal form itself, counsel states that the director "seems to have ignored the letters of recommendation" accompanying the petition. The director, however, acknowledged those letters in the decision. Counsel also states that the director "seems to have ignored the [petitioner's] personal statement." The petitioner's own statements represent claims rather than evidence. Counsel's assertions on appeal represent general statements rather than specific allegations of error. The bare assertion that the director somehow erred in rendering the decision is not sufficient basis for a substantive appeal.

Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

We note that the petitioner is the beneficiary of a second immigrant visa petition, which was approved. The petitioner's application to adjust status is currently pending.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.