

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



B3

Date: **MAY 25 2012** Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE:

IN RE:           Petitioner:   
                  Beneficiary:

PETITION:     Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as Outstanding Professor or Researcher Pursuant to  
                  Section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(B)

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 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 with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a 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,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The beneficiary has a doctorate in Confucianism. He has filed this petition, seeking to classify himself as an outstanding professor or researcher pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(B). The director denied the petition on December 15, 2010, on the basis that the regulations make no provision for an individual to self-petition for the requested classification. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 204.5(c), 204.5(i)(1).

The beneficiary submits a timely appeal. The beneficiary has not submitted a brief or any further evidence on appeal.<sup>1</sup> He provides the following as his reason for the appeal:

First, you should thoroughly understand, I am a travel in the community, Professor of Humanities in the field, rather than natural science and engineering laboratory professor. Thus, unlike the employment by the employer to play a role. but both employers, there will be no employer. [sic]

The beneficiary failed to cite to specific errors on the part of the director or describe the evidence the director allegedly failed to analyze.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. §103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An 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.

A review of the decision reveals the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the petition. The beneficiary's general statement regarding the director's decision is not sufficient to meet the requirements for filing a substantive appeal. Therefore, as the beneficiary has failed to specifically identify an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in this proceeding the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup>On appeal the beneficiary submitted several documents which have previously been submitted into the record.