




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)



DATE: JUN 12 2013

OFFICE: CALIFORNIA 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, California Service Center (director), denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. 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 restaruant. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a cook (Indian). 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 denying the petition concluded that the beneficiary submitted fraudulent evidence in an attempt to establish that he possessed the minimum required experience as of the priority date.

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 April 11, 2013, the AAO sent the petitioner a notice of intent to dismiss the appeal (NOID) with a copy to counsel of record. The NOID informed the petitioner that it had failed to establish that: it was still an operating business; that it had properly withdrawn an earlier petition which utilized the same labor certification as the instant petition; that the job offer was bona fide; and that the significant inconsistencies in the record had not been reconciled. The NOID informed the petitioner that the AAO intended to enter a finding of fraud or willful misrepresentation pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C). The AAO noted that, in addition to the fraudulent expience letter submitted by the beneficiary, according to a different petition for an immigration benefits, the beneficiary lived in Texas and owned several businesses with a personal income of \$10,000 per month. The beneficiary submitted contradictory evidence with the instant petition which alleges he lives in California, and was accepting the proffered job for \$2,000 per month.

The NOID also informed the petitioner that a finding of fraud or willful misrepresentation could invalidate the labor certification pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13)(i). The NOID allowed 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).

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 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).

Furthermore, the AAO finds that the petitioner and beneficiary have provided fraudulent information, or at the very least, willfully mislead USCIS. *See* section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C), regarding misrepresentation, "(i) in general – any alien, who by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks (or has sought to procure, or who has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission to the United States or other benefit provided under the Act is inadmissible."

See also 20 C.F.R. § 656.31(d) regarding labor certification applications involving fraud or willful misrepresentation:

(d) finding of fraud or willful misrepresentation. If as referenced in Sec. 656.30(d), a court, the DHS or the Department of State determines there was fraud or willful misrepresentation involving a labor certification application, the application will be considered to be invalidated, processing is terminated, a notice of the termination and the reason therefore is sent by the Certifying Officer to the employer, attorney/agent as appropriate.

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.

FURTHER ORDER: The AAO finds that the beneficiary knowingly misrepresented a material fact by submitting fraudulent documents in an effort to procure a benefit under the Act and the implementing regulations.