

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



306

FILE: [REDACTED]
SRC 07 222 53986

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date:


OCT 02 2009

IN RE: Petitioner:
 Beneficiary:



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).

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.

On appeal, counsel stated:

Petitioner adequately demonstrated the ability to pay the salary of the proposed beneficiary. The adjudicating officer arbitrarily and capriciously denied the petition based on flawed reasons.

Counsel stated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. The AAO received the appeal on June 4, 2008. As of this date, more than 15 months later, the AAO has received nothing further.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(vii) states in pertinent part:

Additional time to submit a brief. The affected party may make a written request to the AAO for additional time to submit a brief. The AAO may, for good cause shown, allow the affected party additional time to submit one.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(viii) states in pertinent part:

Where to submit supporting brief if additional time is granted. If the AAO grants additional time, the affected party shall submit the brief directly to the AAO.

Counsel, here, did not request any additional time beyond the 30 days listed on Form I-290B.

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 identified any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact and has not provided any additional evidence on appeal to demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.