



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: **JUL 06 2012** OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]  
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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:  
[REDACTED]

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,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska 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, and failed to establish that the beneficiary had the requisite experience. Additionally, the director noted that the record does not contain the required Part B of ETA 750, signed by the substituted beneficiary.

On appeal, counsel merely stated that the “[p]etitioner has the financial ability to pay the proffered wage,” and that the “[b]eneficiary possesses the required prior work of experience [*sic*] to meet the minimum requirements.”

Counsel dated the appeal September 10, 2009. As of this date, more than 33 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 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.