



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: **APR 11 2014** OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

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 (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas 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.

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) regulation at 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, filed on September 5, 2013, the petitioner stated: “I submitted many evidences of the request and could not see that they have been fairly interpreted by the officer who made the decision. I am committed to provide you with supporting documentations within 30 days of the date of September 2nd.” To date, more than seven months after the filing of the appeal, careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision.

The petitioner’s statement on appeal contains no specific allegation of error, only the assertion that unspecified evidence was not “fairly interpreted.” This general claim that the director somehow erred in rendering the decision is not sufficient basis for a substantive appeal.

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

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.