

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 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

BE



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 10 2008  
SRC 07 004 52446

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]  
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to  
Section 203(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom, Acting Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a motel. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a housekeeper. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor, accompanied the petition.<sup>1</sup> The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition and denied the petition accordingly.

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 this decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's original November 18, 2006 denial, the single issue in this case is whether or not the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence.

---

<sup>1</sup> We note that the case involves the substitution of a beneficiary on the labor certification. Substitution of beneficiaries was permitted by the DOL at the time of filing this petition. DOL had published an interim final rule, which limited the validity of an approved labor certification to the specific alien named on the labor certification application. See 56 Fed. Reg. 54925, 54930 (October 23, 1991). The interim final rule eliminated the practice of substitution. On December 1, 1994, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, acting under the mandate of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Kooritzky v. Reich*, 17 F.3d 1509 (D.C. Cir. 1994), issued an order invalidating the portion of the interim final rule, which eliminated substitution of labor certification beneficiaries. The *Kooritzky* decision effectively led 20 CFR §§ 656.30(c)(1) and (2) to read the same as the regulations had read before November 22, 1991, and allow the substitution of a beneficiary. Following the *Kooritzky* decision, DOL processed substitution requests pursuant to a May 4, 1995 DOL Field Memorandum, which reinstated procedures in existence prior to the implementation of the Immigration Act of 1990 (IMMACT 90). DOL delegated responsibility for substituting labor certification beneficiaries to Citizenship and Immigration Services ("CIS") based on a Memorandum of Understanding, which was recently rescinded. See 72 Fed. Reg. 27904 (May 17, 2007) (codified at 20 C.F.R. § 656). DOL's final rule became effective July 16, 2007 and prohibits the substitution of alien beneficiaries on permanent labor certification applications and resulting certifications. As the filing of the instant case predates the rule, substitution will be allowed for the present petition. An I-140 petition for a substituted beneficiary retains the same priority date as the original ETA 750. Memo. from Luis G. Crocetti, Associate Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, to Regional Directors, *et al.*, Immigration and Naturalization Service, *Substitution of Labor Certification Beneficiaries*, at 3, [http://ows.doleta.gov/dmstree/fm/fm96/fm\\_28-96a.pdf](http://ows.doleta.gov/dmstree/fm/fm96/fm_28-96a.pdf) (March 7, 1996).

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 or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

The regulation at 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 either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements. In a case where the prospective United States employer employs 100 or more workers, the director may accept a statement from a financial officer of the organization which establishes the prospective employer's ability to pay the proffered wage. In appropriate cases, additional evidence, such as profit/loss statements, bank account records, or personnel records, may be submitted by the petitioner or requested by [U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)].

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The priority date in the instant petition is April 27, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$30,900 annually.

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). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal<sup>2</sup>. Relevant evidence submitted on appeal includes counsel's brief, a letter, dated December 28, 2006, from ██████████, C.P.A., a letter, dated December 12, 2006, from ██████████ of ██████████ & Company, Certified Public Accountants, a copy of the petitioner's previously submitted 2001 Form 1120S, U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation, and copies of the petitioner's 2001 through 2006 bank statements. Other relevant evidence includes copies of the

---

<sup>2</sup> 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).

petitioner's 2002 through 2005 Forms 1120S. The record does not contain any other evidence relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner's 2001 through 2005 Forms 1120S reflect ordinary incomes or net incomes from Schedule K of -\$17,808, \$63,116, \$34,943, \$30,246, and \$26,711, respectively. The petitioner's 2001 through 2005 Forms 1120S also reflect net current assets of -\$868, \$259, \$2,579, \$7,477, and \$2,733, respectively.

The letter, dated December 28, 2006, from [REDACTED] states:

I have reviewed the bank statements of [the petitioner] for the period February 2003 to November 2005. I also reviewed the corporation income tax returns for calendar years 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, and 2001.

\* \* \*

The ability to pay the proffered wages is not determined based on the taxable income reported on the tax return or on the balance sheet but is determined by the ability of the company to generate cash flows from operations. In order to arrive at operating cash flows certain non-cash expenses like depreciation and amortization are added back since they have no impact on the operating cash outflows. In addition, certain one-time expenses that are deductible for tax purposes are added back since they have no bearing in determining the future cash flows of the business.

\* \* \*

Based upon the above analysis and bank balances maintained the company has the ability to pay the proffered wage of \$30,900 per year.

The letter, dated December 12, 2006, from [REDACTED] states:

[The petitioner] owns and operates a franchise hotel/motel. In 2001, its financial performance along with the rest of the tourism and lodging industry may have been affected by the events of September 11, 2001. In the years after 2001, [the petitioner] has shown a consistent profit. Its federal tax returns show a profit of \$63,201 in 2002, \$52,918 in 2003, \$50,363 in 2004, and \$38,840 in 2005.

On appeal, counsel asserts:

Considering above analysis,

1. From the priority date of April 27, 2001, the economic indicators for ability to pay should not be considered for first 4 months.

2. In next eight months, last 4 months from September 11, 2001 terrorist attack, which had virtually halted the traveling and hospitality business should be pardoned from calculations of ability to pay.
3. Considering, 2001 as a[n] unusual year in the hospitality business of America in the entire recorded history of this business it should not be considered on the same basis or the same criteria as laid down by the Memo of "Determination of ability to pay under 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2)" HQOPRD 90/16.45 dated May 4, 2004.
4. Bank account records should be considered as appropriate evidence in this case to establish ability to pay.

\* \* \*

Thus, rather than looking at or considering one year's tax returns, the doctrine of the totality of circumstances should be considered to decide the fate of this case.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA 750 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA 750, 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). In evaluating whether a job offer is realistic, USCIS requires the petitioner to demonstrate financial resources sufficient to pay the beneficiary's proffered wages, although the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning business will be considered if the evidence warrants such consideration. *See Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed the beneficiary at the time the priority date was established. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, this evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. In the instant case, on the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on September 12, 2006, the beneficiary does not claim the petitioner as a past or present employer. In addition, counsel has not submitted any Forms W-2 or Forms 1099-MISC, Miscellaneous Income, issued by the petitioner on behalf of the beneficiary, as proof of the beneficiary's employment with the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner has not established that it employed the petitioner in the pertinent years (2001 through 2005), and it is obligated to show that it had sufficient funds to pay the entire proffered wage of \$30,900 in those years. In addition, the AAO notes that the petitioner has filed an additional Form I-140 with a priority date in the same year or subsequent years; and,

therefore, the petitioner is obligated to show that it had sufficient funds to pay all of the proffered wages for all the beneficiaries filed for with those priority dates.<sup>3</sup>

As an alternative means of determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS will next examine the petitioner's net income figure as reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. Reliance on federal income tax returns as a basis for determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is well established by federal case law. *See Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava*, 632 F. Supp. 1049, 1054 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) (citing *Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F.2d 1305 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984)); *see also Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Tex. 1989); *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F.Supp. 1080 (S.D.N.Y. 1985); *Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd.*, 703 F.2d 571 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983). In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc.*, the court held that USCIS had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns, rather than the petitioner's gross income. 623 F.Supp at 1084. The court specifically rejected the argument that USCIS should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. Finally, there is no precedent that would allow the petitioner to add back to net cash the depreciation expense charged for the year. *See Elatos Restaurant Corp.*, 632 F. Supp. at 1054. The court in *Chi-Feng Chang* further noted:

Plaintiffs also contend the depreciation amounts on the 1985 and 1986 returns are non-cash deductions. Plaintiffs thus request that the court *sua sponte* add back to net cash the depreciation expense charged for the year. Plaintiffs cite no legal authority for this proposition. This argument has likewise been presented before and rejected. *See Elatos*, 632 F. Supp. at 1054. [USCIS] and judicial precedent support the use of tax returns and the *net income figures* in determining petitioner's ability to pay. Plaintiffs' argument that these figures should be revised by the court by adding back depreciation is without support.

(Emphasis in original.) *Chi-Feng Chang*, 719 F. Supp. at 537.

Where an S corporation's income is exclusively from a trade or business, USCIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner's IRS Form 1120S. However, where an S corporation has income, credits, deductions or other adjustments from sources other than a trade or business, they are reported on Schedule K. If the Schedule K has relevant entries for additional income, credits, deductions or other adjustments, net income is found on line 23 (1997-2003) or line 17e (2004-2005) of Schedule K. *See* Instructions for Form 1120S, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (accessed November 21, 2008) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholder's shares of the corporation's income, deductions, credits, etc.). Because the petitioner had additional 2001 through 2005 income and deductions shown on its Schedule K, the petitioner's net income is found on line 23 of Schedule K for 2001 through 2003 and line 17e for 2004 and 2005.

---

<sup>3</sup> The AAO notes that the petitioner has also filed a subsequent Form I-140 with the Nebraska Service Center for the current beneficiary.

In the instant case, the petitioner's net incomes for 2001 through 2005 were -\$17,808, \$63,116, \$34,943, \$30,246, and \$26,711, respectively. The petitioner could have paid the proffered wage of \$30,900 from its net income in 2002 and 2003 (provided it had not filed an additional immigrant petition),<sup>4</sup> but not in 2001, 2004, and 2005.

Nevertheless, the petitioner's net income is not the only statistic that can be used to demonstrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. If the net income the petitioner demonstrates it had available during that period, if any, added to the wages paid to the beneficiary during the period, if any, do not equal the amount of the proffered wage or more, USCIS will review the petitioner's assets. The petitioner's total assets include depreciable assets that the petitioner uses in its business. Those depreciable assets will not be converted to cash during the ordinary course of business and will not, therefore, become funds available to pay the proffered wage. Further, the petitioner's total assets must be balanced by the petitioner's liabilities. Otherwise, they cannot properly be considered in the determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Rather, USCIS will consider *net current assets* as an alternative method of demonstrating the ability to pay the proffered wage.

Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.<sup>5</sup> A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If a corporation's end-of-year net current assets are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage out of those net current assets. The petitioner's 2001 through 2005 net current assets were -\$868, \$259, \$2,579, \$7,477, and \$2,733, respectively. The petitioner could not have paid the proffered wage of \$30,900 from its net current assets in 2001 through 2005. Therefore, the petitioner has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage in 2001 through 2005.

On appeal, counsel claims that the petitioner has established its ability to pay the proffered wage based on its net income, its bank statements, and the totality of the circumstances. In addition, the petitioner's CPA states that the petitioner's depreciation and amortization should be added back to the net income when determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$30,900.

---

<sup>4</sup> There is no evidence in the record of proceeding that provides the amount of the proffered wage to the additional beneficiary; and, therefore, the AAO is unable to determine if the petitioner had sufficient funds to pay both wages (if the priority date is 2002) from its net income in 2002. If the priority date for the additional worker is in 2003, it does not appear reasonable that the petitioner could have paid the proffered wage of \$30,900 to the beneficiary and the additional wages to the other beneficiary.

<sup>5</sup> According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 2000), "current assets" consist of items having (in most cases) a life of one year or less, such as cash, marketable securities, inventory and prepaid expenses. "Current liabilities" are obligations payable (in most cases) within one year, such as accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

Counsel and the petitioner's CPA are mistaken. Counsel's reliance on the balances in the petitioner's bank accounts is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), required to illustrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. While this regulation allows additional material "in appropriate cases," the petitioner in this case has not demonstrated why the documentation specified at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) is inapplicable or otherwise paints an inaccurate financial picture of the petitioner. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. Third, no evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the funds reported on the petitioner's bank statements somehow reflect additional available funds that were not reflected on its tax return, such as the petitioner's taxable income (income minus deductions) or the cash specified on Schedule L that is considered when determining the petitioner's net current assets.

The CPA's argument that the petitioner's depreciation deduction should be included in the calculation of its ability to pay the proffered wage is unconvincing.

A depreciation deduction does not require or represent a specific cash expenditure during the year claimed. It is a systematic allocation of the cost of a tangible long-term asset. It may be taken to represent the diminution in value of buildings and equipment, or to represent the accumulation of funds necessary to replace perishable equipment and buildings. But the cost of equipment and buildings and the value lost as they deteriorate is an actual expense of doing business, whether it is spread over more years or concentrated into fewer.

While the expense does not require or represent the current use of cash, neither is it available to pay wages. No precedent exists that would allow the petitioner to add its depreciation deduction to the amount available to pay the proffered wage. *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F.Supp. 532 (N.D. Texas 1989). See also *Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava*, 632 F.Supp. 1049 (S.D.N.Y. 1985). The petitioner's election of accounting and depreciation methods accords a specific amount of depreciation expense to each given year. The petitioner may not now shift that expense to some other year as convenient to its present purpose, nor treat it as a fund available to pay the proffered wage. Further, amounts spent on long-term tangible assets are a real expense, however allocated.

The CPA's claim that the petitioner's amortization deduction should be included in the calculation of its ability to pay the proffered wage is also unconvincing. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 83 (6<sup>th</sup> ed. 1990) defines amortization as the allocation (and charge to expense) of the cost of other basis of an intangible asset over its estimated useful life. Intangible assets which have an indefinite life (e.g., goodwill) are not amortizable. Examples of amortizable intangibles include organization costs, patents, copyrights and leasehold interests. A reduction in a debt or fund by periodic payments covering interest and part of principal, distinguished from: (1) depreciation, which is an allocation of the original cost of an asset computed from physical wear and tear as well as the passage of time, and (2) depletion, which is a reduction in the book value of a resource (such as minerals) resulting from conversion into a salable product. The operation of paying off bonds, stock, a mortgage, or other indebtedness, commonly of a state or corporation, by installments, or by a sinking fund. An "amortization plan" for the payment of an indebtedness is one where there are partial payments of the principal, and accrued interest, at stated periods for a definite time, at the expiration of which the

entire indebtedness will be extinguished. There is no evidence in the record of proceeding that the petitioner could postpone or neglect to pay its periodic payments covering interest and part of the principal of its debts involving intangible assets. The assertions of counsel (the CPA in this case) do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

With regard to the events of September 11, 2001, the record of proceeding contains no evidence specifically connecting the petitioner's business decline to the events of September 11, 2001, not even a statement from the petitioner showing a loss or claiming difficulty in doing business specifically because of that event. A mere broad statement by counsel that, because of the nature of the petitioner's industry, its business was impacted adversely by the events of September 11, 2001, cannot by itself, demonstrate the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. Rather, such a general statement merely suggests, without supporting evidence, that the petitioner's financial status might have appeared stronger had it not been for the events of September 11, 2001.

Counsel requests that USCIS prorate the proffered wage for the portion of the year that occurred after the priority date. We will not, however, consider 12 months of income towards an ability to pay a lesser period of the proffered wage any more than we would consider 24 months of income towards paying the annual proffered wage. While USCIS will prorate the proffered wage if the record contains evidence of net income or payment of the beneficiary's wages specifically covering the portion of the year that occurred after the priority date (and only that period), such as monthly income statements or pay stubs, the petitioner has not submitted such evidence. In addition, the petitioner has not submitted any evidence that the months that only generated income in 2001 was May, June, July, and August. Again, going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

Finally, if the petitioner does not have sufficient net income or net current assets to pay the proffered salary, USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the entity's business activities. Even when the petitioner shows insufficient net income or net current assets, USCIS may consider the totality of the circumstances concerning a petitioner's financial performance. See *Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967). In *Matter of Sonogawa*, the Regional Commissioner considered an immigrant visa petition, which had been filed by a small "custom dress and boutique shop" on behalf of a clothes designer. The district director denied the petition after determining that the beneficiary's annual wage of \$6,240 was considerably in excess of the employer's net profit of \$280 for the year of filing. On appeal, the Regional Commissioner considered an array of factors beyond the petitioner's simple net profit, including news articles, financial data, the petitioner's reputation and clientele, the number of employees, future business plans, and explanations of the petitioner's temporary financial difficulties. Despite the petitioner's obviously inadequate net income, the

Regional Commissioner looked beyond the petitioner's uncharacteristic business loss and found that the petitioner's expectations of continued business growth and increasing profits were reasonable. *Id.* at 615. Based on an evaluation of the totality of the petitioner's circumstances, the Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner had established the ability to pay the beneficiary the stipulated wages.

As in *Matter of Sonogawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to a petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of a petitioner's net income and net current assets. USCIS may consider such factors as the number of years that the petitioner has been doing business, the established historical growth of the petitioner's business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry, whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service, or any other evidence that USCIS deems to be relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. In this case, the petitioner's tax returns indicate it was incorporated in 1999. The petitioner has provided its tax returns for 2001 through 2005, with only the 2002 and 2003 tax return establishing the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$30,900 (provided the petitioner had not filed an additional Form I-140). In addition, the tax returns are not enough evidence to establish that the business has met all of its obligations in the past or to establish its historical growth. There is also no evidence of the petitioner's reputation throughout the industry or of any temporary and uncharacteristic disruption in its business activities. Furthermore, the petitioner has filed an additional immigrant petition with the same or subsequent priority date. Therefore, the petitioner must establish that it had sufficient funds to pay all the wages from the priority date and continuing to the present. If the instant petition were the only petition filed by the petitioner, the petitioner would be required to produce evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage to the single beneficiary of the instant petition. However, where a petitioner has filed multiple petitions for multiple beneficiaries which have been pending simultaneously, the petitioner must produce evidence that its job offers to each beneficiary are realistic, and therefore, that it has the ability to pay the proffered wages to each of the beneficiaries of its pending petitions, as of the priority date of each petition and continuing until the beneficiary of each petition obtains lawful permanent residence. See *Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977) (petitioner must establish ability to pay as of the date of the Form MA 7-50B job offer, the predecessor to the Form ETA 750 and Form ETA 9089). See also 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

Beyond the decision of the director, the record in this case indicates that the current beneficiary may not be substituted for the original beneficiary as the labor certification the petitioner provided reflects a different place of employment than the one provided on the ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on September 12, 2006. 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*, 299 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); see also *Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a de novo basis).

On the ETA 750A, question 6 reflects the employer's address as [REDACTED] Topeka, Kansas 66604. The ETA 750B signed by the original beneficiary shows the same address under question 8. However, on the ETA 750B signed by the current beneficiary, the employer's address is shown as [REDACTED], Okawville, IL 62271.

The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(c)(2) states in pertinent part:

A labor certification involving a specific job offer is valid only for the particular job opportunity and for the area of intended employment stated on the Application for Alien Employment Certification form.

Area of intended employment is limited by definition in 20 C.F.R. § 656.3 as "the area within normal commuting distance of the place (address) on intended employment." *See Matter of Sunoco Energy Development Company*, 17 I&N Dec. 283 (change of area of intended employment).

In the instant case, the area of intended employment as certified by the Department of Labor is Topeka, Kansas, not Okawville, Illinois. In addition, Okawville, Illinois is not within commuting distance of Topeka, Kansas. In fact, the two cities are approximately 338 miles apart or approximately a 5 ½ hour drive. Therefore, the labor certification is not valid and the visa petition may not be approved.

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 dismissed.