


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

(b)(6)

DATE **AUG 17 2012** 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:

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

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed the decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed as abandoned.

The petitioner describes itself as an automotive service company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an automotive painter pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. §1153(b)(3). A labor certification approved by the U.S. Department of Labor accompanied the petition.

The director's decision denying the petition concluded that the petitioner did not have the ability to pay the proffered wage.

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).

On June 4, 2012, this office notified the petitioner that, according to the New Jersey Division of Revenue, the petitioner's corporate status was revoked. The AAO also requested additional evidence concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage and the beneficiary's qualifying work experience.¹

The petitioner's corporate status is material to whether the job offer, as outlined on the petition, 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 Jersey Division of Revenue, 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, and of the petitioner's ability to pay; and, to submit an experience letter.

More than 30 days have passed and the petitioner has failed to respond to this office's request for evidence that it continues to be an operating business. The petitioner also failed to submit evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage and of the beneficiary's qualifying experience.

¹ The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

(b)(6)

The AAO specifically alerted the petitioner that failure to respond to its 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 abandoned.

² Additionally, 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.