

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:



Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: **MAR 12 2010**

LIN 08 162 51051

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 a 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, Nebraska 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. 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.

The director denied the petition on May 21, 2009, finding that the petitioner failed to demonstrate receipt of a major, internationally recognized award, or that he meets at least three of the regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

The petitioner submits a timely appeal wherein he stated that he would provide a basis for the appeal in a “brief summary and explanation with evidence to meet the regulatory criteria,” which he would submit in 30 days. However, despite the petitioner’s assertion that he would submit additional materials to the AAO within 30 days, to date, no submission has been received.

As such, the petitioner did not elaborate on his argument for appeal, cite to specific errors on the part of the director or describe the evidence the director allegedly failed to analyze. Accordingly, the record is considered to be complete as it now stands.

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.

As the petitioner failed to state any reasons for his appeal, such appeal is not sufficient to meet the requirements for filing a substantive appeal. Therefore, as the petitioner has failed to specifically identify an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.