


(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: **MAY 24 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 (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 building lease and management company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an administrative clerk. 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 petitioner had failed to establish that the beneficiary possessed the requisite education for the proffered position 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 February 19, 2013, the AAO sent the petitioner a notice of intent to dismiss the appeal (NOID) with a copy to counsel of record. The NOID stated that the petitioner had not demonstrated that the beneficiary as qualified for the proffered position or that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date or subsequently. In the NOID, the AAO asked the petitioner to provide evidence regarding its intent regarding the actual minimum requirements for the position and regarding its ability to pay from 2005 through 2012. 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 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).

Beyond the decision of the director,² the evidence in the record does not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage of \$14.62 per hour (\$30,409.60 based on 40 hours per week)

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).

from the priority date of March 25, 2005 onwards. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In order to establish ability to pay, the AAO, in its February 19, 2013 NOID, asked the petitioner to submit its annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements for each year from the priority date. *Id.* The AAO noted that the beneficiary has not yet obtained lawful permanent residence. The AAO stated that record of proceeding contains the petitioner's organization's compiled financial statement for the first six months of 2007 only.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) makes clear that where a petitioner relies on financial statements to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage, those financial statements must be audited. An audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards to obtain a reasonable assurance that the financial statements of the business are free of material misstatements. The unaudited financial statements that the petitioner submitted with the petition are not persuasive evidence. The accountant's report that accompanied those financial statements makes clear that they were produced pursuant to a compilation rather than an audit. As the accountant's report also makes clear, financial statements produced pursuant to a compilation are the representations of management compiled into standard form. The unsupported representations of management are not reliable evidence and are insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage.

The AAO asked the petitioner to submit annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. The AAO also asked the petitioner to submit any Forms W-2 or 1099 issued to the beneficiary by its organization for the same years.

As previously stated, the petitioner failed to respond to the AAO's February 19, 2013 NOID. Accordingly, the petitioner has also failed to establish its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary since the priority date.

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed as abandoned.

² An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).