


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly 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



BE

JUL 09 2007

File: [Redacted]
LIN-05-024-51013

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER


Date:

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) 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 pursuant to Schedule A classification. The director determined that the petitioner could not demonstrate its ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage.

On appeal, the petitioner provided, "Brief to follow." The petitioner indicated that it would send a brief within 30 days.

The appeal was filed on March 9, 2006. As of this date, more than fifteen months after filing the appeal, the AAO has received nothing further. On May 31, 2007, the AAO sent counsel a fax allowing the petitioner to supplement the record with a brief as originally indicated. Counsel did not respond.

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 here has not addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence related to the issue of the petitioner's ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage, the basis on which the petition was denied. Further, the petitioner has failed to identify the specific erroneous conclusion of law. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.