



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[Redacted]

B6

DATE: **DEC 13 2012**

OFFICE: TEXAS 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,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was initially approved by the Director, Texas Service Center. On October 15, 2009, the director served the petitioner with notice of intent to revoke the approval of the petition (NOIR). In a Notice of Revocation (NOR), the director ultimately revoked the approval of the Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140). The petitioner appealed the decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be summarily dismissed as abandoned pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13)(i).

The petitioner describes itself as a restaurant. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as an Indian food cook. 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 labor certification approved by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The director's decision revoking the petition concluded, based upon an internal investigation, that the beneficiary had never been employed as a cook despite the fact that he stated that he worked as a chef at the Hotel Taj from 1994 to 1998 and as a cook at the Mann Marriage Palace beginning in 1998. The director also noted that the information regarding the beneficiary's alleged experience with these entities was not submitted with the Form I-140, and in an interview on April 4, 2008, the beneficiary was unable to convincingly answer questions pertaining to north Indian cooking.

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.¹

On September 12, 2012, the AAO sent the petitioner a notice of intent to dismiss the appeal (NOID) because, according to the Commonwealth of Virginia, your organization was terminated on March 31, 2008.² A copy of the NOID was submitted to counsel of record. The NOID allowed the petitioner 30 days in which to submit a response. The AAO informed the petitioner that failure to respond to the NOID would result in a dismissal of the appeal.

As of the date of this decision, the petitioner has not responded to the AAO's NOID. The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the

¹ 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).

² In the NOID, the petitioner was informed that if it was no longer in business, then no *bona fide* job offer exists and the petition and appeal would be moot.

petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). Since the petitioner failed to respond to the NOID, the appeal will be summarily dismissed as abandoned pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13)(i).

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 summarily dismissed as abandoned.