


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services




B6

Date: **APR 26 2012**

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

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:

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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,


Perry Rhew
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, counsel¹ merely stated that “evidence will be submitted within 30 days.” There was no basis stated for the appeal.

Counsel dated the appeal April 22, 2009. As of this date, more than 35 months later, the AAO has received nothing further, and the regulation requires that any brief shall be submitted directly to the AAO. 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.3(a)(2)(vii) and (viii).

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 for the appeal. In the petitioner’s appeal, prior counsel for the petitioner failed to even express disagreement with the director’s decision, and failed to submit any brief or evidence in support of the appeal. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

¹ On October 12, 2011, the AAO was notified of a change in counsel for the petitioner.