


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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**





PUBLIC COPY



B3

Date: **MAY 17 2011** 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:

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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must 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. On March 11, 2011, this office provided the petitioner with notice of derogatory information in the record and afforded the petitioner an opportunity to provide evidence that might overcome this information.

The petitioner is a gas station. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a manager 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 establish that the beneficiary had the experience required for the position offered. The director also noted a number of discrepancies in the beneficiary's prior employment, which the petitioner failed to resolve.

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.¹

On March 11, 2011, this office notified the petitioner that according to the records at the website maintained by the Florida Secretary of State, the petitioning company had been dissolved on September 25, 2009 and that an issue existed concerning the relationship between the beneficiary to the owners or shareholders of the petitioner.

This office also notified the petitioner that if it is currently dissolved, this is material to whether the job offer, as outlined on the immigrant petition filed by this organization, is a *bona fide* job offer. Moreover, any such concealment of the true status of the organization by the petitioner seriously compromises the credibility of the remaining evidence in the record. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I & N Dec. 582, 586 (BIA 1988) (stating that doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition). It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *See id.*

This office allowed the petitioner 30 days in which to provide evidence that the records maintained by the Florida Secretary of State were not accurate and that the petitioner remains in operation as a viable business or was in operation during the pendency of the petition and appeal. On April 7, 2011, the AAO received a response from the beneficiary, but not the petitioner. This response does not address the status of the petitioning entity.² The petitioner did not submit a response or submit information to

¹ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by the regulation at 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).

² 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(A)(3) provides:

establish that the petitioning entity is still operational and that the job offer remains bona fide. As no evidence was submitted to establish that the petitioner remains a viable entity and that the job offer remains bona fide, the appeal will be dismissed.³ 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).

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.

Representation. An applicant or petitioner may be represented by an attorney in the United States, as defined in §1.1(f) of this chapter, by an attorney outside the United States as defined in § 292.1(a)(6) of this chapter, or by an accredited representative as defined in § 292.1(a)(4) of this chapter. *A beneficiary of a petition is not a recognized party in such a proceeding.*

(Emphasis added.)

³ Additionally, as noted in the notice of derogatory information, even if the appeal could be otherwise sustained, the petition's approval would be subject to automatic revocation pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 205.1(a)(iii)(D) which sets forth that an approval is subject to automatic revocation without notice upon termination of the employer's business in an employment-based preference case.