




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B6

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



FILE:

LIN 02 248 51190

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: MAR 07 2006

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:



PETITION: Immigrant petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

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

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3), as a skilled worker. The director determined that the petitioner had not established the petitioner's identity, that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition, or that the beneficiary had met the minimum experience and job qualifications.

On appeal, counsel submits no brief and no additional evidence, and while asserting that the petitioner has the ability to pay and that the beneficiary has the requisite experience, she does not point to any specific error in the decision or even address the director's finding of "the uncertainty regarding the exact petitioning entity."

It is noted that the director explained in detail why he found that the petitioner had not established its identity among several different corporations owned by the same shareholder in addition to why the record of proceedings does not establish either the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage or that the beneficiary met the minimum experience the ETA 750 required.

By contrast, counsel does not, on appeal, supplement previously submitted evidence.

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.