


(b)(6)

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



DATE: **AUG 29 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,

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 carpet wholesaler. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a market analyst pursuant to sections 203(b)(3)(A)(i) and (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i) and (ii). 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 satisfied the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification. The director determined that the beneficiary's credentials could not be accepted as a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. bachelor's degree in business administration because the beneficiary held a three-year bachelor's degree.

The AAO issued Notice of Intent to Dismiss and Request for Evidence on June 11, 2012 concerning the actual minimum educational requirements of the offered position.¹ The AAO explained that it consulted a database that did not equate the beneficiary's credentials to a U.S. baccalaureate degree and the evidence in the record of proceeding as currently constituted did not support a determination that the petitioner intended the actual minimum requirements of the offered position to include alternatives to a bachelor degree such as the credentials and work experience held by the beneficiary. The AAO solicited additional evidence of the beneficiary's credentials and evidence of how the petitioner expressed its actual minimum educational requirements to the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) during the labor certification process.

Additionally, the AAO requested evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage of \$34,216 continuously since October 29, 2004; as well as the wage for the additional Form I-140 that the petitioner filed during the period of its pendency.


Finally, the AAO requested evidence to establish whether the petition is based on a bona fide job offer, or whether a pre-existing family and business relationship may have influenced the labor certification. It was noted that the beneficiary is a founding director and part owner of the petitioner, and that the majority owner of the petitioner is the beneficiary's father.

The AAO specifically alerted the petitioner that failure to respond to the Notice of Intent to Dismiss and Request for Evidence would result in dismissal since the AAO could not substantively adjudicate the appeal without the information requested. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(iv).

Because the petitioner failed to respond to the Notice of Intent to Dismiss and Request for Evidence, 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.

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



(b)(6)

Page 3

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.