




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE: [REDACTED]
SRC 06 800 18278

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date: **MAR 24 2009**

IN RE:



PETITION: Immigrant petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)


ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).


John F. Grissom, Acting Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3) as a skilled worker. The director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate a continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

The regulation at 8 CFR §§ 103.3(a)(2)(vii) and (viii) states that an affected party may make a written request to the AAO for additional time to submit a brief and that, if the AAO grants the affected additional time, it may submit the brief directly to the AAO.

On appeal, counsel merely stated that he disagreed with the Service's determination regarding the petitioner's financial ability to pay the prevailing wage rate for the beneficiary. Counsel indicated that he would be sending a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days.

Counsel dated the appeal January 18, 2007.¹ As of this date, more than two years 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.

Counsel here has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

¹ The AAO notes that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) first received the appeal on January 22, 2007, but counsel had failed to sign it. Counsel resubmitted the appeal, which USCIS received on February 20, 2007.