

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

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**

B2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

DEC 02 2010

IN RE:

Petitioner:

[REDACTED]

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:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

S 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 “alien of extraordinary ability” as a fashion designer, pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A). The director determined that the petitioner had not established the requisite extraordinary ability through extensive documentation and sustained national or international acclaim.

On appeal, counsel states:

We wish to appeal the denial dated August 13, 2009 (See attached copy of denial).

As you will notice reviewing this denial, it appears that the denial is a template used for applicants to the extent that on page 4 the officer state [sic] that [the petitioner] has failed to establish that she is one of the very few who has risen to the top of the judicial system. Which leads you to conclude that this is a general denial and it does not appear to discuss the particular qualifications of [the petitioner].

[The petitioner] provided extensive evidence to establish her outstanding qualifications in the fashion industry. The record shows that [the petitioner] worked with fashion powerhouses such as PRADA, designers from Givenchy and Dolce and Gabbana. She also worked with hot new comers to the fashion industry that had seek her advise [sic] with regards to New York Fashion Week.

[The petitioner] is well respected and known in the fashion industry one of the most competitive industries in the world in New York which is one of the most competitive markets in the world.

Based on the foregoing, [the petitioner’s] record should be taken [sic] further consideration.

We acknowledge the director’s erroneous reference to the “judicial system” on page 4 of the decision. However, the sentence immediately preceding the director’s typographical error states: “The beneficiary has not submitted evidence which demonstrates that she is nationally or internationally recognized in the fashion industry or that she has sustained any national acclaim or international acclaim.” Moreover, pages 2 and 3 of the director’s decision also correctly refer to the petitioner’s field as the fashion industry. Accordingly, the typographical error on page 4 identified by counsel did not prejudice the petitioner.

On appeal, counsel does not specifically challenge any of the director’s findings or his analyses of the evidence submitted for the categories of evidence at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). Moreover, the appellate submission was unaccompanied by arguments or evidence addressing the categories of evidence at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) which the petitioner claims to meet. On the Form I-290B, Notice

of Appeal or Motion, counsel checked box "C" in Part 2 indicating that the petitioner would not be submitting a supplemental brief or additional 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.

The petitioner has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any *additional evidence pertaining to the classification sought*. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.