



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B₂

[REDACTED]

DATE: **DEC 18 2012** Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER [REDACTED]

IN RE: [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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,


Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was initially approved by the Director, Texas Service Center. Subsequently, the director issued a notice of intent to revoke (NOIR) the approval of the petition. In a Notice of Revocation (NOR), the director ultimately revoked the approval of the petition. The matter 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 NOIR and NOR 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 concluded that the petitioner had failed to establish sustained national or international acclaim.

Section 205 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1155, states, in pertinent part, that the Secretary of Homeland Security "may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204."

Regarding the revocation on notice of an immigrant petition under section 205 of the Act, the Board of Immigration Appeals has stated:

In *Matter of Estime*, . . . this Board stated that a notice of intention to revoke a visa petition is properly issued for "good and sufficient cause" where the evidence of record at the time the notice is issued, if unexplained and un rebutted, would warrant a denial of the visa petition based upon the petitioner's failure to meet his burden of proof. The decision to revoke will be sustained where the evidence of record at the time the decision is rendered, including any evidence or explanation submitted by the petitioner in rebuttal to the notice of intention to revoke, would warrant such denial.

Matter of Ho, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 590 (BIA 1988) (citing *Matter of Estime*, 19 I&N Dec. 450 (BIA 1987)).

By itself, the director's realization that a petition was incorrectly approved is good and sufficient cause for the revocation of the approval of an immigrant petition. *Id.* The approval of a visa petition vests no rights in the beneficiary of the petition, as approval of a visa petition is but a preliminary step in the visa application process. *Id.* at 589. The beneficiary is not, by mere approval of the petition, entitled to an immigrant visa. *Id.*

Part 3 of the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, includes a space for the petitioner to "[p]rovide a statement explaining any erroneous conclusion of law or fact in the decision being appealed." Counsel states:

- a) The validity of the unfavorable decision has not been nor is the subject of any judicial proceeding.

- b) The Service's decision was in error because the evidence submitted with the original application and with the response to the Notice of Intent to Revoke is sufficient to establish eligibility as determined by the approval of the I-140.
- c) The Service's decision was based on an incorrect application of law and Service policy.

The preceding statement fails to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or fact in the director's decision. The petitioner does not specifically challenge any of the director's findings or point to specific errors in the director's analyses of the documentary evidence submitted for the categories of evidence at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). Further, the petitioner does not explain how the specific documentary evidence that she submitted supports a finding of eligibility. A passing reference without substantive arguments is insufficient to raise that ground on appeal. *Desravines v. U.S. Atty. Gen.*, 343 Fed.Appx. 433, 435 (11th Cir. 2009). 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 matter, 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.

In Part 2 of the Form I-290B, the petitioner checked box "B" indicating "[m]y brief and/or additional evidence will be submitted to the AAO within 30 days." The appeal was filed on August 24, 2012. As of this date, more than three 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 her eligibility for the classification sought. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.