

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**

BK



File: [Redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 09 2007  
EAC 03 169 51449

In re: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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)

IN 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 of the Vermont Service Center denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily 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 an aeronautical engineer. The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel indicated that he would submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days and stated the following: "Beneficiary clearly is qualified and possesses the credentials for the position offered."

Counsel dated the appeal September 16, 2005. As of this date, more than two years later, the AAO has received nothing further. The AAO sent a fax to counsel on August 17, 2007 informing counsel that no separate brief and/or evidence was received, to confirm whether or not he would send anything else in this matter, and as a courtesy, providing him with five days to respond. To date, more than four weeks later, no reply has been received.

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.