



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the  
Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 19131887

Date: OCT. 26, 2022

Appeal of Decision Nebraska Service Center Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Extraordinary Ability)

The Petitioner, a sailing instructor, seeks classification as an individual of extraordinary ability. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(1)(A), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A). This first preference classification makes immigrant visas available to those who can demonstrate their extraordinary ability through sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in their field through extensive documentation.

The Director of the Nebraska Service Center denied the petition, concluding that the Petitioner did not establish that he received a one-time achievement (a major, internationally recognized award) or that he satisfied at least three of the initial evidentiary criteria, as required for the requested classification. The matter is now before us on appeal.

On appeal, the Petitioner submits two letters of recommendation previously submitted and a letter dated April 14, 2021, after the filing of the initial petition, offering the Petitioner employment as a head coach with a yacht club. Notably, the Petitioner did not provide a statement regarding the basis for the appeal, as instructed in Part 3 of Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, either in Part 7, Additional Information, of the form, or in a separate statement.

Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) state, in pertinent part, “An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.”

The Petitioner here has not specifically identified erroneous conclusions of law or statements of fact in the decision notice. He does not articulate additional grounds of eligibility that the Director did not address nor did he contest the Director’s decision. We are summarily dismissing the appeal because it does not specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in the unfavorable decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).