

(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

[Redacted]

DATE: **AUG 02 2012** 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:
[Redacted]

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

(b)(6)

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center (the director). It then came before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. On May 8, 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 is a company which engages in metal coating. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a metal spray operator, pursuant to section 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 approved by the Department of Labor accompanied the petition. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. Therefore, the director denied the petition.

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

On May 8, 2012, this office notified the petitioner that according to the records at the official website maintained by the California Secretary of State and public records accessed through Westlaw, the petitioner is currently dissolved.¹ See [REDACTED] (accessed April 14, 2012).

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.*

¹ In our notice, the AAO also addressed issues related to the petitioner's ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage from the priority date until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. In our notice, we indicated that the petitioner provided tax documents from a company which had a name similar to the petitioner's but was not the petitioner. The AAO explained its analysis of the various evidentiary documents contained in the record as well as the findings of a review of public records and indicated that the evidence demonstrated that the petitioner, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] the company for which financial documentation was supplied, are two separate and distinct business organizations. Given the situation, the AAO requested evidence of [REDACTED]'s ability to pay the beneficiary or evidence demonstrating that [REDACTED] is a successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]. In failing to respond to the notice with the requested evidence, the petitioner has not demonstrated the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date or at any time subsequent.

This office allowed the petitioner 30 days in which to provide evidence that the records maintained by the California 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. 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.

The AAO specifically alerted the petitioner that failure to respond to the notice would result in dismissal since the AAO could not substantively adjudicate the appeal without the information requested. 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). Thus, the appeal will be dismissed as abandoned.²

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.

² 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.