

Identifying data deleted to
prevent identity unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B5



FILE:



Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

OCT 06 2008

LIN 06 100 52234

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, Chief
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 dismissed.

The petitioner is an Internet products and services company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a professional services architect pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2). As required by statute, an ETA Form 9089 Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor (DOL), accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the beneficiary did not satisfy the minimum level of education required for the classification sought.

On appeal, counsel merely expressed his belief that the director's decision was in error and stated that he would submit a brief and/or evidence to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) within 30 days.

Counsel dated the appeal January 16, 2006. As of September 18, 2008, more than 20 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. In response, counsel confirmed that no brief had been submitted.

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. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.