

(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: OCT 29 2013

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:

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  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed as abandoned pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13)(i).

The petitioner describes itself as a unit motor inn. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a hotel manager. 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 petition is accompanied by a labor certification approved by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The director's decision denying the petition concluded that the petitioner failed to establish it possessed the continued ability to pay the proffered wage.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>1</sup>

On June 11, 2013, the AAO sent the petitioner a notice of intent to dismiss the appeal and notice of derogatory information (NOID) with a copy to counsel of record. The NOID informed the petitioner that according to the terms of the labor certification the proffered job requires twenty-four months of experience as a hotel manager. The beneficiary claimed to qualify for the proffered job on the ETA Form 9089 by virtue of his experience with ██████████ Kenya from February 1, 2003 through March 3, 2005. An experience verification letter was submitted into the record, which claimed to be from ██████████ and vouched for the beneficiary's experience as a hotel manager during the claimed time period.

The AAO contacted The ██████████ to confirm the details of the letter. The Human Resources Manager, ██████████ was provided with a copy of the employment verification letter and was asked if it was authentic. Ms. ██████████ stated that the letterhead on the proffered letter was not the approved letterhead at the time the letter was dated. Next, Ms. ██████████ stated that: the owner of the hotel is not ██████████ as claimed on the letter; and, the beneficiary was not employed by the hotel as a manager as claimed on the letter. Furthermore, the hotel is not a 55 unit hotel, but is a large luxury hotel in ██████████ established in 1902. Ms. ██████████ stated that the only accurate detail on the letter was the hotel's address.

---

<sup>1</sup> The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

The NOID allowed the petitioner 30 days in which to submit a response. The AAO informed the petitioner that failure to respond to the NOID would result in a dismissal of the appeal. As of the date of this decision, the petitioner has not responded to the AAO's NOID. 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). Since the petitioner failed to respond to the NOID, the appeal will be summarily dismissed as abandoned pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13)(i).

The petitioner failed to rebut this evidence. Thus, the AAO finds that your organization and the beneficiary have provided fraudulent evidence in support of an immigrant visa petition. *See* section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C), regarding misrepresentation, "(i) in general – any alien, who by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks (or has sought to procure, or who has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission to the United States or other benefit provided under the Act is inadmissible."

*See also* 20 C.F.R. § 656.31(d) regarding labor certification applications involving fraud or willful misrepresentation:

(d) finding of fraud or willful misrepresentation. If as referenced in Sec. 656.30(d), a court, the DHS or the Department of State determines there was fraud or willful misrepresentation involving a labor certification application, the application will be considered to be invalidated, processing is terminated, a notice of the termination and the reason therefore is sent by the Certifying Officer to the employer, attorney/agent as appropriate.

The AAO also finds that the labor certification must be invalidated. The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(d) provides:

(d) Invalidation of labor certifications. After issuance, a labor certification may be revoked by ETA using the procedures described in Sec. 656.32. Additionally, after issuance, a labor certification is subject to invalidation by the DHS or by a Consul of the Department of State upon a determination, made in accordance with those agencies' procedures or by a court, of fraud or willful misrepresentation of a material fact involving the labor certification application. If evidence of such fraud or willful misrepresentation becomes known to the CO or to the Chief, Division of Foreign Labor Certification, the CO, or the Chief of the Division of Foreign Labor Certification, as appropriate, shall notify in writing the DHS or Department of State, as appropriate. A copy of the notification must be sent to the regional or national office, as appropriate, of the Department of Labor's Office of Inspector General.

In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

**FURTHER ORDER:** The AAO finds that the petitioner and beneficiary knowingly misrepresented a material fact by submitting fraudulent documents in an effort to procure a benefit under the Act and the implementing regulations. The labor certification application (C-05237-26427) is invalidated pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(d) based on the petitioner's fraudulent misrepresentation.