

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6

JUL 09 2007

File: LIN-05-202-51340

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.

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. The director determined that the petitioner could not demonstrate that it was the successor-in-interest to the entity that filed Form ETA 750 on behalf of the beneficiary.

On appeal, the petitioner provided, "The decision is in error." 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 30, 2007, the AAO sent counsel a fax allowing the petitioner to supplement the record with a brief as originally indicated. Counsel responded, "please adjudicate on the record," and did not submit any further 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.

The petitioner here has not addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence related to the issue of successorship, 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.