

identity information deleted to
protect privacy of the individual
and to protect the privacy of the

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PHILIP COPY

[Redacted]

B5

FILE: [Redacted] SRC 04 008 51454

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: 05/11/2010

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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.

Maui Johnson

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be 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 an alien of exceptional ability or a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. 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 had not established that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer would be in the national interest of the United States.

On appeal, counsel merely stated that the petitioner is qualified for the benefit sought and that additional letters were being submitted. Counsel indicated that he would submit a brief and/or evidence to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) within 30 days. No additional letters were included with the appeal.

Counsel dated the appeal December 16, 2004. As of August 18, 2005, more than eight months later, the AAO had received nothing further. Thus, on that date, this office contacted counsel by facsimile, advising that we had received no additional materials, inquiring as to whether anything had been submitted and requesting a copy of any additional materials submitted. The facsimile advised that failure to respond to our inquiry within five business days may result in the summary dismissal of the appeal. As of this date, approximately three weeks later, this office has received no response.

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.

Merely affirming the petitioner's purported eligibility is not a substantive appeal. Counsel here 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.