


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


(b)(6)



DATE: **SEP 10 2013** OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER




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 (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition and the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed a subsequent appeal. The matter is again before the AAO on motion to reopen and reconsider. The motion to reopen and reconsider the petition will be granted. The appeal will be summarily dismissed as abandoned pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13)(i).

The petitioner describes itself as an information technology services business. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a project manager. 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 has not demonstrated that the beneficiary met the minimum requirements of the proffered position as of the August 5, 2002 priority date.¹ The AAO dismissed the subsequent appeal on February 5, 2010.

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.²

On May 31, 2013, the AAO sent the petitioner a notice of reopening/reconsideration and request for evidence (RFE) with a copy to counsel of record. The AAO requested confirmation that the petitioner has the continuing intent to employ the beneficiary in the offered position described on the labor certification; and clarification on whether the petitioner is a subsidiary of [REDACTED], or whether [REDACTED] is a successor-in-interest to the petitioner (e.g., as the result of a merger). The RFE allowed the petitioner 45 days in which to submit a response. The AAO informed the petitioner that failure to respond to the RFE would result in a dismissal of the appeal.

As of the date of this decision, the petitioner has not responded to the AAO's RFE. The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the

¹ The director references the labor certification as both Form ETA 750 and ETA Form 9089 in his decision, however, the record reflects that Form ETA 750 was used and it was filed on August 5, 2002.

² 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).

petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). Since the petitioner failed to respond to the RFE, the appeal will be summarily dismissed as abandoned pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13)(i).

In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.