

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B2



FILE: 
SRC 08 033 52828

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: NOV 09 2009

IN RE: Petitioner: 
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Alien of Extraordinary Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).


Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant 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 summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks classification as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A), as an alien of extraordinary ability in athletics. The director determined that the petitioner had not established the sustained national or international acclaim necessary to qualify for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability. Specifically, the director concluded that the petitioner did not meet at least three of the regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

On appeal, counsel generally states that the petitioner has satisfied “at least three of the criteria,” and that “extensive evidence” was submitted establishing the petitioner’s extraordinary ability a coach of table tennis. Counsel further stated that he would submit a brief and/or additional evidence to the AAO within 30 days. Counsel dated the appeal on May 15, 2009. As of this date, 6 months later, the AAO has received nothing further. Accordingly, the record is considered complete as it now stands.

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.