

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 19 2012**

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE:

Petitioner: [REDACTED]

Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, on July 22, 2011, 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 boxer. Congress set a very high benchmark for aliens of extraordinary ability by requiring through the statute that the petitioner demonstrate “sustained national or international acclaim” and present “extensive documentation” of his or her achievements. *See* section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). The implementing regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) states that an alien can establish sustained national or international acclaim through evidence of a one-time achievement, specifically a major, internationally recognized award. Absent the receipt of such an award, the regulation outlines ten categories of specific evidence. 8 C.F.R. §§ 204.5(h)(3)(i) through (x). The petitioner must submit qualifying evidence under at least three of the ten regulatory categories of evidence to establish the basic eligibility requirements.

In the director’s decision, the director thoroughly discussed the documentary evidence submitted by the petitioner and determined that the petitioner failed to establish eligibility for the awards criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i), the published material criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iii), the original contributions criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(v), and the high salary criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(ix). Moreover, the director found that the petitioner failed to submit any documentary evidence regarding any of the other regulatory categories of evidence pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). Finally, the director conducted a final merits determination in accordance with *Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2010) and determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate a (1) “level of expertise indicating that the individual is one of that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the[ir] field of endeavor,” 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2); and (2) “that the alien has sustained national or international acclaim and that his or her achievements have been recognized in the field of expertise.” *See* section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)(i), and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

On appeal, counsel claimed in part 3 on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion:

USCIS has made erroneous conclusion that the applicant has not met at least three of the ten criteria found at 8 C.F.R. 204.5(h)(3). USCIS has made erroneous conclusion that the applicant has not reached a level of expertise indicating that he is one of that small percentage who had risen to the top of the field of endeavor. USCIS has made erroneous conclusion that the applicant’s achievements do not set him significantly above almost all others in the field at a national or international level and does not establish sustained acclaim. USCIS has made erroneous conclusion that the applicant is not an individual of extraordinary ability.

Rather than challenging any of the director's specific findings, counsel generally alleges that the director made erroneous conclusions. 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, counsel 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. Instead, counsel makes general assertions without specifically identifying any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. Again, counsel offers no argument that demonstrates error on the part of the director based upon the record that was before her.

As stated in the regulation at 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. As counsel did not contest any of the specific findings of the director and offers no substantive basis for the filing of the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.