

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

B6



FILE: [Redacted]
SRC 06 206 51036

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date: APR 15 2008

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)

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 for

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a healthcare staffing company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a registered nurse. The petitioner asserts that the beneficiary qualifies for blanket labor certification pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.10, Schedule A, Group I. As set forth in the director's November 14, 2006 denial, the director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary possessed the required credentials to work as a nurse in the United States. The director concluded that the beneficiary is not eligible for certification pursuant to Schedule A. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The petitioner submitted a Form I-290B appeal in this matter. In the section reserved for the basis of the appeal, the petitioner inserted,

“[w]e believe that Ms. [redacted] file is in accordance with the requirements of the Service.”

No further information, argument, or documentation was submitted.

On the appeal form, the petitioner did not indicate that a brief or additional evidence would be submitted. The appeal will be adjudicated based on the evidence of record.

The petitioner's statement on appeal contains no specific assignment of error. Alleging that the director erred in some unspecified way is an insufficient basis for an appeal.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part: “An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.”

The petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal and the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.