

**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

B6

**PUBLIC COPY**




File: [Redacted] WAC-02-035-55803

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 07 2006

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:



**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, California Service Center, revoked the previously approved immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be 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 a skilled worker. The director revoked the previously approved immigrant visa petition following a consular investigation into the beneficiary's alleged work experience used to meet the qualifications of the certified labor certification. The investigation concluded that the letter supplied to document the beneficiary's work experience was not valid, and the petitioner did not supply any additional information to show that the beneficiary otherwise met the labor certification requirements. Upon receipt of the Service Center's Notice of Intent to Revoke, the petitioner had submitted a second letter from the source that wrote the original experience letter on behalf of the beneficiary, which sought to reconcile incongruous aspects between the first letter and information obtained during the consular investigation. The Service Center relied on *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988), which states: "Doubt raised on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition." Further, "It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies will not suffice." *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. at 591-592. As the petitioner failed to reconcile the inconsistencies, and the beneficiary could not provide any further information regarding prior experience to show that he met the requirements of the certified labor certification, the previously approved I-140 was revoked by decision of February 10, 2005.

On appeal, counsel merely stated: "We disagree with the decision made by the US Citizenship and Immigration Services." The appeal form indicated that the petitioner would not be submitting a separate brief or evidence.

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.