

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: 

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:


SELF-REPRESENTED

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 August 29, 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. 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 membership criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(ii), the published material criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iii), the judging criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv), the original contributions criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(v), the scholarly articles criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vi), the artistic display criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vii), and the leading or critical role criterion pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(viii). Moreover, 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, the petitioner claimed in part 3 on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion:

The applicant believes that she has and will continue to have extraordinary ability in the sciences, art, education, business and athletics. The applicant did her best in her original application to demonstrate that she has sustained national or international acclaim and that her achievements have been recognized in the field of expertise. The applicant believes that she is one of the small percentages [sic] who have risen on the very top of her field of endeavor. The applicant plans to continue in her area of extraordinary ability and will benefit the United States throughout her entire life. Please refer to the original application and to my answer to the RFE letter, that was received by USCIS on August 17, 2011.

Rather than challenging any of the director's specific findings, the petitioner makes general assertions without explaining how the conclusions of the director were incorrect as a matter of law or statement of fact. 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. Again, the petitioner 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 the petitioner 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.