


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: **MAY 02 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 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,
Elizabeth McCormack

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. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a church. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i). As required by statute, a labor certification accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner did not have sufficient net income or net current assets to pay the proffered wage of the beneficiary from the priority date until the beneficiary receives her legal permanent residence, particularly in 2007.

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

In adjudicating the appeal, the AAO noted that the petitioner has filed multiple employment-based visa petitions for other beneficiaries.¹ On February 1, 2012, the AAO issued a Request for Evidence and Notice of Derogatory Information (RFE/NDI) requesting the petitioner to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wages of all of the beneficiaries from the priority date.

The AAO specifically alerted the petitioner that failure to respond to the RFE would result in dismissal without further discussion 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).

Because the petitioner failed to respond to the RFE, the AAO is dismissing the appeal without further discussion.

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.

¹ The details of the other petitions are disclosed in the AAO's RFE/NDI and will not be repeated here.