

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

B6



Date:

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

File:



DEC 02 2011

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 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 October 20, 2011, this office provided the petitioner with Notice of Derogatory Information (NDI) in the record and afforded the petitioner an opportunity to provide evidence that might overcome this information.

The petitioner is an automotive repair business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an automotive body and related repair person pursuant to sections 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3). As required by statute, a labor certification accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onwards and failed to establish that the beneficiary had the experience required by the terms of the labor certification.

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 October 20, 2011, this office notified the petitioner that according to records maintained by the New York Secretary of State, the petitioning company was dissolved in the state of New York (“Inactive – Dissolution by Proclamation/Annulment of Authority”). *See* New York Secretary of State website, at [http://appext9.dos.state.ny.us/corp\\_public/CORPSEARCH.ENTITY\\_INFORMATION?p](http://appext9.dos.state.ny.us/corp_public/CORPSEARCH.ENTITY_INFORMATION?p) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (copy of which was attached to the AAO’s NDI and originally accessed October 13, 2011).

This office notified the petitioner that if it is currently not operational, 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 New York Secretary of State were not accurate and that the petitioner remains in operation as a

---

<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 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).

viable business or was in operation during the pendency of the petition and appeal. 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 or was in operation from the priority date onwards. Thus, the appeal will be dismissed as abandoned.<sup>2</sup>

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>2</sup> 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.