

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



B2

DATE: **JUL 07 2011** Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE:

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,

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. The director's decision sufficiently discussed the deficiencies in the petitioner's documentary evidence as it related to the categories of evidence at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) and found that the petitioner had failed to establish sustained national or international acclaim and that she was among that small percentage at the very top of her field of endeavor. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2).

On appeal, counsel states:

We believe the Service did not conduct adequate review of the evidence provided under the criteria I, IV, VII as well as X of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

[The petitioner] has met her burden of proof in establishing her qualification for at least three of the ten criteria specified in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) and has achieved sustained national or international acclaim in her field of endeavor.

A detailed brief will be submitted separately.

Counsel's comments do not specifically challenge any of the director's findings or her analyses of the documentary evidence submitted for the categories of evidence at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) provides that "[a]n officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal." In this case, the petitioner has not identified as a proper basis for the appeal an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in the director's decision. The petitioner's appellate submission offers no argument that demonstrates error on the part of the director based upon the record that was before her. Moreover, the appellate submission was unaccompanied by 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 March 8, 2010. As of this date, more than fifteen 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.