



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**



B2

FILE:



Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JAN 08 2008

EAC 06 017 51628

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:

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, 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 as a computer programmer. The director determined the petitioner had not established that she qualifies for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability.

On appeal, the petitioner states:

THE SERVICE DID NOT TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE ENTIRE BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE OF THE APPLICANT. THE APPLICANT BELIEVES THAT ALL EVIDENCE SUBMITTED IN BEHALF OF HER PETITION WAS NOT REVIEWED BY [CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES]. APPLICANT WILL SUBMIT A BRIEF WITH EXHIBITS TO SUPPORT HER CLAIM THAT THE DECISION WAS MADE IN ERROR.

The appellate submission was unaccompanied by arguments or evidence addressing the pertinent regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

The petitioner indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. The appeal was filed on March 2, 2007. As of this date, more than nine months later, the AAO has received nothing further.

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 petitioner 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.