

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

Ble



FILE:

EAC 03 031 52171

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: MAY 20 2005

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Alien of Extraordinary Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks classification as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A), as an alien of extraordinary ability in the sciences. The director determined the petitioner had not established the sustained national or international acclaim necessary to qualify for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability.

On appeal, the petitioner states:

In the denial letter it was stated that I do not qualify as an alien of extraordinary abilities. I respectfully believe this decision has been a mistake and my file contains sufficient evidence to meet the requirements for the "person of extraordinary abilities."

* * *

I am going to attach additional important pieces of evidence including reference letters from leading independent scientists and thought leaders from my home country, Armenia, as well as from the U.S. I have already applied to some of them, specifically in Armenia. I am getting the favorable response, in sense they are ready to review my work. However, many of my correspondents indicate that, due to their busy schedule and numerous responsibilities, they are not in a position to promptly review my file. Rather, they ask for up to 2 months time to complete their evaluation.

The petitioner indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be submitted to the AAO within sixty days. The appellate submission was unaccompanied by arguments or evidence addressing the pertinent regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

The appeal was filed on September 30, 2004. As of this date, more than seven months later, the AAO has received nothing further.

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.

The petitioner 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.