

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6



File: WAC-00-265-53888 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **APR 30 2008**

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:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann for

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center (director) initially approved the employment-based preference visa petition. Following approval, the director served the petitioner with a Notice of Intent to Revoke the Approval of the Petition (NOIR). In a Notice of Revocation (NOR), the director ultimately revoked the approval of the Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140). The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a computer hardware and software distributor and seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a buyer (Product Specialist). As required by statute, the petition filed was submitted with Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the Department of Labor (DOL). As set forth in the director's February 3, 2005 decision, the petition's approval was revoked¹ based on a determination, after the beneficiary was interviewed at a local USCIS office in connection with his I-485 adjustment application, that the petitioner failed to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date of the labor certification until the beneficiary obtained permanent residence.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a de novo basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp.*, NTSB, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's de novo authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989).²

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely 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. The procedural history in this case is long, and will be outlined in greater detail.

The petitioner has filed to obtain permanent residence and classify the beneficiary as a skilled worker. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2), and Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States. *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(b).

The petitioner must establish that its ETA 750 job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. A petitioner's filing of an ETA 750 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later filed based on the approved ETA 750. The priority date is the date that Form ETA 750 Application for Alien Employment Certification was accepted for processing by any office within the employment service system

¹ With respect to revocation, Section 205 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1155, provides that "[t]he Attorney General [now Secretary, Department of Homeland Security], may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204." The realization by the director that the petition was approved in error may be good and sufficient cause for revoking the approval. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 590 (BIA 1988). Accordingly, the director has the authority to revoke the petition's approval at any time. Whether the beneficiary is in the United States or not, has no bearing on this issue.

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 the regulation at 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).

of the Department of Labor. *See* 8 CFR § 204.5(d). Therefore, the petitioner must establish that the job offer was realistic as of the priority date, and that the offer remained realistic for each year thereafter, until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. The petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is an essential element in evaluating whether a job offer is realistic. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977). *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

The regulation 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states in pertinent part:

Ability of prospective employer to pay wage. Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

The history of the case is quite lengthy and complicated, but pertinent to this matter, and in order to fully understand its progression, is summarized in a chronology as follows:

- On April 8, 1996, the petitioner, [REDACTED], filed Form ETA 750 on behalf on the beneficiary for the position of buyer ("Purchasing Specialist"), at a pay rate of \$3,000 per month, equivalent to an annual salary of \$36,000 per year;
- On May 30, 2000, the Form ETA 750 is approved;
- On September 14, 2000, the petitioner filed Form I-140 on behalf of the beneficiary. The petitioner listed the following information on the I-140 Petition: established: October 1994; gross annual income: "see financials;" net annual income: "see financials;" and current number of employees: 10.
- On October 25, 2000, the director issued a Request for Evidence for the petitioner to submit documentation related to the petitioner's ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage;
- On July 20, 2001, the director approved the I-140 petition;
- On November 20, 2001, the beneficiary filed an I-485 Adjustment of Status application based on the approved I-140;
- On March 3, 2002, the Service Center issued an RFE related to the beneficiary's I-485;
- On November 7, 2002, the beneficiary was scheduled for an Adjustment of Status interview at the local Citizenship and Immigration Services ("CIS") office, but the interview was cancelled and rescheduled;
- The Adjustment of Status interview was rescheduled for February 12, 2003;
- The Adjustment of Status interview was then rescheduled for April 23, 2003;
- On February 27, 2004, the district director notified the beneficiary and his representative that the I-485 application would be transferred back to the California Service Center for review and possible revocation of the visa petition's approval;
- On July 8, 2004, the director issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke on the basis that the beneficiary's wife was the sole owner of the petitioner,³ and further, that the petitioner had not demonstrated its ability to pay the proffered wage, specifically in the years 1996 and 1997;

³ Under 20 C.F.R. §§ 626.20(c)(8) and 656.3, the petitioner has the burden when asked to show that a valid employment relationship exists, that a *bona fide* job opportunity is available to U.S. workers. *See Matter of Amger Corp.*, 87-INA-545 (BALCA 1987). A relationship invalidating a *bona fide* job offer may arise where

- The petitioner responded and provided that the director incorrectly identified the petitioner's owner, the beneficiary's wife, as a sole proprietor. Instead, counsel noted that the petitioner was a corporation, and that a corporation is a separate entity.⁴ Further, counsel provided that the petitioner's bank account records would show the petitioner's ability to pay beyond just strictly looking at its tax returns.⁵
- On February 3, 2005, the director revoked the petition's approval, based on the petitioner's failure to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage, as of the date of the petition's approval. Specifically, the decision outlined the petitioner's net income and net current assets and determined that the petitioner could not pay the proffered wage in 1996, 1997, and 1998;
- On February 3, 2005, the Service Center issued a Notice of Intent to Deny the beneficiary's I-485 Adjustment of status application;
- On February 18, 2005, the petitioner appealed the I-140 revocation and alleged that: "1. the decision failed to consider other information in the tax return and in the record which substantiates the employer's ability to pay. A brief with additional evidence will be filed within 30 days; and 2. the Director has no authority to revoke a visa petition where the alien is already in the United States."

On October 24, 2005, counsel forwarded additional documentation on behalf of the petitioner related to the appeal and asserted that the beneficiary had obtained a new employer and should be allowed to adjust under the American Competitiveness in the Twenty First Century Act of 2000 (AC21),⁶ which allows for change in employment.⁷ Counsel did not address or raise any points related to the petitioner's tax returns, what aspect

the beneficiary is related to the petitioner by "blood" or it may "be financial, by marriage, or through friendship." See *Matter of Summart 374*, 00-INA-93 (BALCA May 15, 2000). If the petitioner did not reveal the relationship to DOL, then the bona fides of the position may be in question.

⁴ While a corporation is a separate entity, see *Matter of M*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958), *Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980), and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980), the petitioner's tax returns reflect that the beneficiary is the sole shareholder. As noted above, under 20 C.F.R. §§ 626.20(c)(8) and 656.3, the petitioner has the burden when asked to show that a valid employment relationship exists, that a *bona fide* job opportunity is available to U.S. workers. See *Matter of Amger Corp.*, 87-INA-545 (BALCA 1987). A relationship invalidating a *bona fide* job offer may arise where the beneficiary is related to the petitioner by "blood" or it may "be financial, by marriage, or through friendship." See *Matter of Summart 374*, 00-INA-93 (BALCA May 15, 2000). As the beneficiary is married to the petitioner's sole shareholder, then the bona fides of the position may be in question.

⁵ First, we note that bank statements are not among the three types of evidence listed in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) as required to establish a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. This regulation allows for consideration of additional material such as bank accounts "in appropriate cases." Further, the petitioner's cash assets listed on Schedule L have already considered in calculating the petitioner's net current assets above. The petitioner has not established that the bank balances represent funds in addition to cash assets listed on Schedule L, and, therefore, the bank statements would not demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Further, as a fundamental point, the petitioner's tax returns are a better reflection of the company's financial picture, since tax returns address the question of liabilities. Bank statements do not reflect whether the petitioner has any outstanding liabilities.

⁶ Pub. L. No. 106-313, 114 Stat. 1251 (Oct. 17, 2000).

⁷ An individual may qualify for "portability" (employment with a new employer) based on the American Competitiveness in the 21st Century Act (AC21), Pub.L.No. 106-313, which became law on October 17, 2000. AC21 § 106(c), which added a new subsection (j) to section 204 of the INA, which states:

of the petitioner's returns that the director failed to consider as cited on Form I-290B, or specifically what other documentation in the record demonstrates the petitioner's ability to pay. Accordingly, as the petitioner had not provided any evidence on this issue, it has failed to overcome the basis for revocation. Therefore, the petition's approval was properly revoked for good and sufficient cause as the petitioner failed to establish that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date until the beneficiary obtains permanent residence.

Section 205 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1155, states: "The Secretary of Homeland Security may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204."

Regarding the revocation on notice of an immigrant petition under section 205 of the Act, the Board of Immigration Appeals has stated:

In *Matter of Estime*, . . . this Board stated that a notice of intention to revoke a visa petition is properly issued for "good and sufficient cause" where the evidence of record at the time the notice is issued, if unexplained and un rebutted, would warrant a denial of the visa petition based upon the petitioner's failure to meet his burden of proof. The decision to revoke will be sustained where the evidence of record at the time the decision is rendered, including any evidence or explanation submitted by the petitioner in rebuttal to the notice of intention to revoke, would warrant such denial.

Matter of Ho, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 590 (BIA 1988)(citing *Matter of Estime*, 19 I&N Dec. 450 (BIA 1987)).

The petitioner has failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage, and the petition would, therefore, warrant denial. The petitioner's evidence submitted on appeal is insufficient to overcome the basis for revocation, and, therefore, the revocation will be sustained.

Related to counsel's assertion regarding the beneficiary's portability, the petitioner provided copies of the beneficiary's paychecks from his new employer, Starmicro Access Inc. for the time period April 1, 2005 to the end of September 2005.⁸

As the initial petition's approval was revoked, the beneficiary would seek portability based on a revoked, and unapproved I-140 petition. No related statute or regulation would render the beneficiary portable under these facts.

Job Flexibility for Long Delayed Applicants for Adjustment of Status to Permanent Residence - A petition under subsection (a)(1)(D) for an individual whose application for adjustment of status pursuant to section 245 has been filed and remained adjudicated for 180 days or more shall remain valid with respect to a new job if the individual changes jobs or employers if the new job is in the same or a similar occupational classification as the job for which the petition was filed.

⁸ Counsel previously forwarded documentation to the director related to the beneficiary's I-485 application that the beneficiary had obtained employment with StarMirco Access Inc. as a Purchasing Manager as of March 4, 2005 at a salary of \$3,100 per month.

The pertinent section of AC 21, Section 106(c)(1), amended section 204 of the Act, codified at section 204(j) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(j) provides:

Job Flexibility For Long Delayed Applicants For Adjustment Of Status To Permanent Residence. - A petition under subsection (a)(1)(D) [since redesignated section 204(a)(1)(F)] for an individual whose application for adjustment of status pursuant to section 245 has been filed and remained unadjudicated for 180 days or more shall remain valid with respect to a new job if the individual changes jobs or employers if the new job is in the same or a similar occupational classification as the job for which the petition was filed.

Section 212(a)(5)(A)(iv) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(5)(A)(iv), states further:

Long Delayed Adjustment Applicants- A certification made under clause (i) with respect to an individual whose petition is covered by section 204(j) shall remain valid with respect to a new job accepted by the individual after the individual changes jobs or employers if the new job is in the same or a similar occupational classification as the job for which the certification was issued.

Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act includes the immigrant classification for individuals holding baccalaureate degrees who are members of the professions and skilled workers under section 203(b)(3) of the Act, the classification sought in the underlying petition.

An immigrant visa is immediately available to an alien seeking employment-based preference classification under section 203(b) of the Act (such as the beneficiary in this case) when the alien's visa petition has been approved and his or her priority date is current. 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2). Hence, adjustment of status may only be granted "by virtue of a valid visa petition approved in [the alien's] behalf." 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(2).

After enactment of the portability provisions of AC21, on July 31, 2002, CIS published an interim rule allowing for the concurrent filing of Form I-140 and Form I-485, whereby an employer may file an employment-based immigrant visa petition and an application for adjustment of status for the alien beneficiary at the same time without the need to wait for an approved I-140. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245.2(a)(2)(B)(2004); *see also* 67 Fed. Reg. 49561 (July 31, 2002). The beneficiary in the instant matter had filed his Form I-485 on July 13, 2006, concurrently with the petitioner's filing of Form I-140.

CIS implemented concurrent filing as a convenience for aliens and their U.S. employers. Because section 204(j) of the Act applies only in adjustment proceedings, CIS never suggested that concurrent filing would make the portability provision relevant to the adjudication of the underlying visa petition. Rather, the statute and regulations prescribe that aliens seeking employment-based preference classification must have an immigrant visa petition approved on their behalf before they are even eligible for adjustment of status. Section 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a); 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2).

Section 204(j) of the Act prescribes that "A petition . . . shall remain valid with respect to a new job if the individual changes jobs or employers." The term "valid" is not defined by the statute, nor does the congressional record provide any guidance as to its meaning. *See* S. Rep. 106-260, 2000 WL 622763 (Apr. 11, 2000); *see also* H.R. Rep. 106-1048, 2001 WL 67919 (Jan. 2, 2001). However, the statutory language and framework for granting immigrant status, along with recent decisions of three federal circuit courts of appeals, clearly show that the term "valid," as used in section 204(j) of the Act, refers to an approved visa petition.

Statutory interpretation begins with the language of the statute itself. *Hughey v. U.S.*, 495 U.S. 411, 415 (1990). We are expected to give the words used in the statute their ordinary meaning. *I.N.S. v. Cardoza-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 431 (1987) (citing *I.N.S. v. Phinpathya*, 464 U.S. 183, 189 (1984)). We must also construe the language in question in harmony with the thrust of related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *K Mart Corp. v. Cartier Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988). See also *COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561, 573 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1996).

With regard to the overall design of the nation's immigration laws, section 204 of the Act provides the basic statutory framework for the granting of immigrant status. Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(F), provides that “[a]ny employer desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification under section . . . 203(b)(1)(B) . . . of this title may file a petition with the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] for such classification.”

Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), governs CIS's authority to approve an immigrant visa petition before immigrant status is granted:

After an investigation of the facts in each case . . . the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is . . . eligible for preference under subsection (a) or (b) of section 203, approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

Statute and regulations allow adjustment only where the alien has an approved petition for immigrant classification. Section 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a); 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2).⁹

Pursuant to the statutory framework for the granting of immigrant status, any United States employer desiring and intending to employ an alien “entitled” to immigrant classification under the Act “may file” a petition for classification. Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(F). However, section 204(b) of the Act mandates that CIS approve that petition only after investigating the facts in each case, determining that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien is eligible for the requested classification. Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). Hence, Congress specifically granted CIS the sole authority to approve an immigrant visa petition; an alien may not adjust status or be granted immigrant status by the Department of State until CIS approves the petition.

Therefore, to be considered “valid” in harmony with the portability provision of section 204(j) of the Act and with the statute as a whole, an immigrant visa petition must have been filed for an alien that is entitled to the requested classification and that petition must have been approved by CIS pursuant to the agency's authority under the Act. See generally section 204 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154. A petition is not validated merely through the act of filing the petition with CIS or through the passage of 180 days.

⁹ We note that the Act contains at least one provision that does apply to pending petitions; in that instance, Congress specifically used the word “pending.” See Section 101(a)(15)(V) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(V) (establishing a nonimmigrant visa for aliens with family-based petitions that have been pending three years or more).

Section 204(j) of the Act cannot be interpreted as allowing the adjustment of status of an alien based on an unapproved visa petition when section 245(a) of the Act explicitly requires an approved petition (or eligibility for an immediately available immigrant visa) in order to grant adjustment of status. To construe section 204(j) of the Act in that manner would violate the “elementary canon of construction that a statute should be interpreted so as not to render one part inoperative.” *Dept. of Revenue of Or. v. ACF Indus., Inc.*, 510 U.S. 332, 340 (1994).

Accordingly, it would subvert the statutory scheme of the U.S. immigration laws to find that a petition is valid when that petition was never approved or, even if it was approved, if it was filed on behalf of an alien that was never entitled to the requested immigrant classification. We will not construe section 204(j) of the Act in a manner that would allow ineligible aliens to gain immigrant status simply by filing visa petitions and adjustment applications, thereby increasing CIS backlogs, in the hopes that the application might remain adjudicated for 180 days.¹⁰

In the case at hand, the I-140 petition’s approval was revoked for good and sufficient cause as the petitioner had failed to establish its ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage from the priority date until the beneficiary obtains permanent residence. The petitioner failed to provide any evidence on appeal to overcome the basis for denial. The beneficiary would therefore not have a valid immigrant visa petition approved on their behalf to be eligible for adjustment of status. Section 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a); 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2).

The enactment of the portability provision at section 204(j) of the Act did not repeal or modify sections 204(b) and 245(a) of the Act, which require CIS to approve an immigrant visa petition prior to granting adjustment of status. Accordingly, as this petition’s approval was revoked, it cannot be deemed valid by improper invocation of section 204(j) of the Act.

Accordingly, the petition’s approval was properly revoked with good and sufficient cause based on the petitioner’s failure to establish that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date until the beneficiary obtains permanent residence. 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 dismissed.

¹⁰ Moreover, every federal circuit court of appeals that has discussed the portability provision of section 204(j) of the Act has done so only in the context of deciding an immigration judge’s jurisdiction to determine the continuing validity of an approved visa petition when adjudicating an alien’s application for adjustment of status in removal proceedings. *Sung v. Keisler*, 2007 WL 3052778 (5th Cir. Oct. 22, 2007); *Matovski v. Gonzales*, 492 F.3d 722 (6th Cir. Jun. 15, 2007); *Perez-Vargas v. Gonzales*, 478 F.3d 191 (4th Cir. 2007). In *Sung*, the court quoted section 204(j) of the Act and explained that the provision only addresses when “an *approved* immigration petition will remain valid for the purpose of an application of adjustment of status.” *Sung*, 2007 WL 3052778 at *1 (emphasis added). *Accord Matovski*, 492 F.3d at 735 (discussing portability as applied to an alien who had a “previously approved I-140 Petition for Alien Worker”); *Perez-Vargas*, 478 F.3d at 193 (stating that “[s]ection 204(j) . . . provides relief to the alien who changes jobs after his visa petition has been approved”). Hence, the requisite approval of the underlying visa petition is explicit in each of these decisions.