



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

(b)(6)

[Redacted]

DATE: OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER FILE: [Redacted]

FEB 28 2013
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 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 general construction business. The petitioner sought to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a bricklayer. As required by statute, a labor certification approved by the Department of Labor accompanied the petition. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. Therefore, the director denied the petition.

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 November 26, 2012, this office notified the petitioner in a Notice of Intent to Dismiss (NOID) and Request for Evidence (RFE) and Notice of Derogatory Information (NODI) that additional evidence and information was necessary before the AAO could render a decision. The AAO noted that the record in this case lacked sufficient evidence to demonstrate a successor-in-interest relationship and was, therefore, unable to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner was informed in the NOID, RFE, and NODI that if it chose not to respond, the AAO would dismiss the appeal without further discussion. 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). The AAO further stated that it would be unable to substantively adjudicate the appeal without a meaningful response to the line of inquiry set forth in the request for evidence.

This office allowed the petitioner 45 days in which to provide the requested evidence. It is noted that the NOID, RFE, and NODI was sent to the petitioner's and to counsel's last known address. More than 45 days have passed and the petitioner has failed to respond to this office's NOID, RFE, and NODI. Thus, the appeal will be dismissed as abandoned. 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 Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

¹ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1).