

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
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B2



DATE: APR 12 2012

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 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. The director determined that the petitioner had not established the requisite extraordinary ability and failed to submit extensive documentation of his sustained national or international acclaim.

On appeal, the petitioner fails to specifically address the reasons stated for the denial and to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact on the part of the director. Instead, counsel merely states that the petitioner “has demonstrated that she is an alien of extraordinary ability,” and that, “We respectfully again point to the evidence initially submitted with the original filing, as well with the response to the request for evidence.”

As stated in the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the concerned party fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. *See also Idy v. Holder*, No. 11-1078, 2012 WL 975567 (1st Cir. Mar. 23, 2012) indicating that where a petitioner challenges the legal basis for the director’s decision, but does not raise any legal issue (erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact) regarding the decision, the appellate body is deprived of jurisdiction over the issue. *See also Desravines v. United States Attorney General*, No. 08-14861, 343 F. App’x 433, 435 (11th Cir. 2009) (finding that issues not briefed on appeal are deemed abandoned); *Tedder v. F.M.C. Corp.*, 590 F.2d 115, 117 (5th Cir. 1979) (deeming abandoned an issue raised in the statement of issues but not anywhere else in the brief). In this instance, the petitioner has not identified a basis for the appeal. The petitioner does not contest the director’s findings and offers no substantive basis for the filing of the appeal. As the petitioner failed to provide any specific statement or argument regarding the basis of his appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.