



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

B6

FILE:

[REDACTED]
LIN 07 087 50009

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUL 06 2009

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.

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).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference 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 dismissed.

The petitioner is a telecommunications company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a DWDM Engineer. The director determined that the petitioner had failed to establish that the beneficiary met the qualifications listed on the Form ETA 9089, Application for Alien Employment Certification, as certified by the U.S. Department of labor and submitted with the instant petition. The director denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, the petitioner states that it made an error in listing the job requirements on the Form ETA 9089. The petitioner has not identified any error of law or fact made by the director. The petitioner also states that an English translation of the beneficiary's diploma, as well as other evidence, will be submitted. However, no such evidence has been received by the AAO. The regulation at 8 CFR §§ 103.3(a)(2)(vii) and (viii) states that an affected party may make a written request to the AAO for additional time to submit a brief and that, if the AAO grants the affected additional time, it may submit the brief directly to the AAO.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), any appeal that fails to specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact will be summarily dismissed.

A review of the decision reveals that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the petition. On appeal, the petitioner has not presented additional evidence. Nor has the petitioner specifically addressed the basis for denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.