U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

(b)(6)

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

DATE: JUN 19 2015 PETITION RECEIPT #:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

Enclosed is the non-precedent decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for your case.

If you believe we incorrectly decided your case, you may file a motion requesting us to reconsider our decision and/or reopen the proceeding. The requirements for motions are located at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Motions must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) **within 33 days of the date of this decision**. The Form I-290B web page (www.uscis.gov/i-290b) contains the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. **Please do not mail any motions directly to the AAO**.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

On the Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129), the petitioner describes itself as a 26-employee "Consulting Services & Software development Services" firm established in In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a "Computer System Analyst" position, the petitioner seeks to classify him as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The Director denied the petition, finding that the evidence did not establish that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation position. On appeal, the petitioner asserts that the Director's basis for denial was erroneous and contends that the petitioner satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

We conducted a preliminary review of the record of proceeding and found that the signature for the petitioner's authorized official, varies significantly throughout the record of proceeding. On April 17, 2015, we issued a notice pertinent to the purported signatures of Ms. . We requested that the petitioner provide specific evidence pertinent to that issue. A response to that notice was due on May 20, 2015. The petitioner did not respond within the time period allowed in the notice, or any time since then.

A petition may be summarily denied as abandoned, denied based on the record, or denied for both reasons if a petitioner or applicant fails to respond to a request for evidence or a notice of intent to deny by the required date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13)(i). 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).

As the petitioner has not responded to our notice, the appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied, due to the failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry, making any remaining issues in this proceeding moot.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.