

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:

DEC 08 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 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

**DISCUSSION:** On August 29, 2001, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), Vermont Service Center (VSC), received an Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, Form I-140, from the petitioner. The employment-based immigrant visa petition was initially approved by the VSC director on September 27, 2002. The director of the Texas Service Center (the director), however, revoked the approval of the immigrant petition on December 15, 2009. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner describes itself as a restaurant. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a cook. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a professional or skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A).

The director's decision revoking the approval of the petition states that the petitioner did not demonstrate that it followed recruitment guidelines and that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary had the experience required by the terms of the labor certification.

On appeal, counsel merely stated that "USCIS erred as a matter of fact and law in revoking the previous approval of said I-140 petition" and indicated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days.

Counsel dated the appeal December 30, 2009. As of this date, more than two years later, the AAO has received nothing further from the petitioner,<sup>1</sup> 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 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The beneficiary sent a letter dated August 29, 2011. The letter identifies the beneficiary as the petitioner. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii)(B) specifically prohibits a beneficiary of a visa petition, or a representative acting on a beneficiary's behalf, from filing an appeal. A beneficiary does not have standing in these proceedings to pursue an appeal and the submissions from the beneficiary may not be considered as a brief on appeal.