

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



FILE:



Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: DEC 28 2010

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:

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,

2 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 in the arts. 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: “The Service was erroneous at the application of law and conclusion of facts that the petitioner didn’t establish that he has sustained national or international acclaim and is one of that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor.” Counsel does not specifically challenge any of the director’s findings or his analyses of the evidence submitted for the regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). Moreover, the appellate submission was unaccompanied by arguments or evidence addressing the regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) which the petitioner claims to meet.

Counsel indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. The appeal was filed on October 30, 2009. As of this date, more than thirteen 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 pertaining to the classification sought. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.