

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

(b)(6)



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

[REDACTED]

DATE: AUG 06 2012 OFFICE: TEXAS 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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,

*Kerry Parlos for*

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a manufacturer of horseback riding equipment. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a helmet maker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i). As required by statute, a labor certification accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary had the required work experience as stated on the labor certification, and that the petitioner failed to establish its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

The AAO issued a notice of intent to dismiss and request for evidence (NOID/RFE) on May 3, 2012 concerning information in the [REDACTED] Department of State database, which indicates that the petitioner, [REDACTED] was dissolved on July 16, 2004. The AAO also solicited additional evidence regarding inconsistent federal employer identification numbers contained in the record.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, the AAO requested additional evidence regarding the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, and evidence of the beneficiary's qualifications for the position.

The AAO specifically alerted the petitioner that failure to respond to the NOID/RFE would result in dismissal since the AAO could not substantively adjudicate the appeal without the information requested. The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

Because the petitioner failed to respond to the NOID/RFE, the AAO is dismissing the appeal.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).