

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

D/



MAR 07 2005
MAR 07 2005

FILE: SRC 03 164 56615 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary



PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

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.

for Michael T. Kelly
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner offers computer systems services to the general public. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a network and computer system administrator, and endeavors to classify her as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

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 director determined that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation and that the beneficiary was not qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the petition was denied.

On appeal, the petitioner declined to submit a brief or additional information in support of the appeal. The petitioner simply states on the Form I-290B that it seeks reconsideration of the director's decision because its evidence was not properly considered and the adjudicating officer was not objective. The petitioner has not specifically identified any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact upon which the appeal is based. The appellant must do more than simply ask for an appeal. It must clearly demonstrate the basis for the appeal. Thus, the appellant has failed to do. As such, the appeal must be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.