



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

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

B5



FILE: EAC 03 174 52446 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **DEC 21 2005**

IN RE: Petitioner:  
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:



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, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

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 March 4, 2005, counsel indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. To date, over nine months later, careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision.

The statement on the appeal form reads, in its entirety: “The reviewing officer for the USCIS did not properly apply the criteria set forth by the Administrative Appeals Unit in Matter of New York State Department of Transportation (AAO, 1998) to the facts and evidence presented by the Petitioner in this case.” This is a general statement that makes no specific allegation of error. Counsel does not, for instance, explain how the director deviated from the precedent decision. 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.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.