

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B5



FILE:



Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: DEC 03 2007

EAC 05 214 50308

IN RE:

Petitioner:



Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will summarily dismiss the appeal.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part, “[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.”

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, under “state the reason(s) for this appeal,” the petitioner stated: “see attached appeal brief.” The body of that brief reads, in full:

By decision dated September 30, 2006 The United States Citizenship and Immigration Service (Hereinafter “Service”) denied my petition I-140 for alien worker.

After carefully consideration of Denial notice, I decided to file the appeal.

I am sure that you with particular consideration will examine my case and will reach to the appropriate decision. In any case thank you for your hard and fruitful job.

[*Sic.*] The petitioner does not allege any error by the director. The petitioner does not mention, let alone contest, the grounds for denial. The petitioner has, in effect, simply requested a re-adjudication of her petition, without identifying any flaws in the director’s adjudication and decision.

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.