





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




DATE: OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE:

FEB 28 2013



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:

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

Page 2

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center. The director reopened the matter sua sponte, and again denied the petition. The petitioner appealed the denial to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2) as a professional holding an advanced degree. The director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary possessed an advanced degree or a bachelors degree coupled with five years of experience as of the priority date.

On appeal, the petitioner exhorts the AAO to examine a credential evaluation which had previously been provided to the director. The petitioner does not provide any new evidence or arguments on appeal addressing the beneficiary's ineligibility.

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 here has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence. He has not even expressed disagreement with the director's decision. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.