


(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




DATE: **AUG 28 2012** OFFICE: NEBRASKA 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-129B, 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed as abandoned.

The petitioner describes itself as a university. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a web applications developer. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a professional or skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A).

The petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The priority date of the petition, which is the date the DOL accepted the labor certification for processing, is September 10, 2003. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

The director's decision denying the petition concludes that the beneficiary did not possess the education required by the terms of the labor certification and for classification as a professional.

The record shows that 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). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>1</sup>

On March 27, 2012, the AAO issued a Request for Evidence (RFE), which apprised the petitioner of inconsistencies in the record and requested additional evidence pertaining to the beneficiary's educational qualifications. The RFE also instructed the petitioner to provide evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date and evidence to establish that the beneficiary possessed the required experience for the offered position. Finally, the RFE requested that the petitioner explain whether or not it intended the terms of the labor certification to require an alternative to a U.S. bachelor's degree or a foreign equivalent degree. The petitioner was given 45 days to respond to the RFE and was further informed that a failure to respond would result in an AAO dismissal of the appeal.

As of the date of this letter, the AAO has not received a response to the RFE. Failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition.

---

<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 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).

8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). Further, since the petitioner failed to respond to the RFE, the appeal will be dismissed as abandoned pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13)(i).

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed as abandoned.