

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

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**



B4.

DATE: **AUG 24 2012** OFFICE: VERMONT SERVICE CENTE FILE:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. Please note that all documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please also note that any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. It then came before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. On July 16, 2012, this office provided the petitioner with notice of adverse information in the record and afforded the petitioner an opportunity to provide evidence that might overcome this information.

The petitioner claims to be a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as Vice President. Accordingly, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C), as a multinational executive or manager.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(i), this office notified the petitioner on July 16, 2012 that, according to the records at the New York Department of States website, the petitioner is currently dissolved. *See* www.dos.ny.gov (accessed July 5, 2012).

This office also notified the petitioner that if it is currently dissolved, this fact is material to its eligibility for the requested visa. Specifically, the petitioner's dissolution raises serious questions about whether it continues to exist as an employer, whether the petitioner maintains a qualifying relationship, and whether it is authorized to conduct business in a regular and systematic manner. *See* section 214(c)(1) of the Act; *see also* 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(l)(1)(ii)(G) and (l)(3).

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). 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. *Id.*

This office allowed the petitioner 30 days in which to provide evidence to rebut the finding that the petitioner has been dissolved. More than 30 days have passed and the petitioner has failed to respond to this office's request for a certificate of good standing or other proof that the petitioner remains in operation as a viable business. Thus, the appeal will be dismissed as abandoned.¹

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

¹ Even if the appeal could be otherwise sustained, the petition's approval would be subject to revocation pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(9)(iii) upon dissolution of the corporate entity.