


(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: **FEB 08 2013** 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-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 Director, Nebraska 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.

The petitioner describes itself as a software development company. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a senior software engineer. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a senior software engineer pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §1153(b)(3)(A)(i).¹ As required by statute, an ETA Form 9089, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the Department of Labor (DOL) accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the beneficiary did not satisfy the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification. Specifically, the director determined that the beneficiary did not possess the requisite education at the time the labor certification was submitted.

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

On October 22, 2012, the AAO notified the petitioner of publicly available information bearing on the case including a press release found on the petitioner's website indicating that it was purchased by another entity on September 6, 2011 as well as Secretary of State records in Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas indicating that the petitioner is currently not in good standing.

The AAO also notified the petitioner that if it no longer exists, 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.*

This office allowed the petitioner 30 days in which to provide evidence that the evidence cited above was 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 evidence that the petitioner remains in operation as a

¹ Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

Page 3

viable business or was in operation from the priority date onwards. 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.