

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**
PUBLIC COPY

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

B6

DATE:

FEB 27 2012

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE:

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other, Unskilled Worker Pursuant to § 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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Elizabeth McCormack

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner describes itself as a designer and builder of custom homes. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a house cleaner. As required by statute, ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL), accompanied the petition. 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 the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's December 15, 2010 denial, at 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.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii), provides for the granting of preference classification to other qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing unskilled labor, 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.

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The petitioner must also demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, as certified by the DOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977).

The ETA Form 9089 states that the position requires three months of experience in the offered job. On the labor certification, the beneficiary indicated that she had worked in the offered job for [REDACTED]. In support of her assertion, the petitioner provided evidence that the beneficiary was owner/operator of [REDACTED]. The petitioner provided copies of business licenses and insurance contracts, confirming the existence of the beneficiary's business. The petitioner also provided copies of statements from several clients of [REDACTED].

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

The petitioner bears the burden to establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA Form 9089 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA Form 9089, 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'l Comm'r 1977); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In evaluating whether a job offer is realistic, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (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'l Comm'r 1967).

The ETA Form 9089 was filed by [REDACTED], and was accepted for processing by the DOL on March 16, 2009. The instant petition was filed by [REDACTED]. In a Request for Evidence (RFE) dated September 2, 2011, the AAO requested the petitioner to submit evidence to establish that [REDACTED] is a successor-in-interest to [REDACTED].

If the petitioner is a different entity from the sponsoring employer, then the petitioner must establish that it is a successor-in-interest to that entity. USCIS has not issued regulations governing immigrant visa petitions filed by a successor-in-interest employer. Instead, such matters are adjudicated in accordance with *Matter of Dial Auto*, a binding, legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service ("INS") decision that was designated as a precedent by the Commissioner in 1986. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions are binding on all immigration officers in the administration of the Act.

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 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).

As a threshold issue, the AAO will discuss whether the petitioner has established that it is the successor-in-interest to [REDACTED] the company that filed the ETA Form 9089 application for permanent employment certification. On September 2, 2011, the AAO sent a Request for Evidence (RFE) to the petitioner seeking evidence of a successor relationship between [REDACTED] and the petitioner [REDACTED].

The facts of the precedent decision, *Matter of Dial Auto*, are instructive in this matter. *Matter of Dial Auto* involved a petition filed by Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc. on behalf of an alien beneficiary for the position of automotive technician. The beneficiary's former employer, Elvira Auto Body, filed the underlying labor certification. On the petition, Dial Auto claimed to be a successor-in-interest to Elvira Auto Body. The part of the Commissioner's decision relating to the successor-in-interest issue follows:

Additionally, the representations made by the petitioner concerning the relationship between Elvira Auto Body and itself are issues which have not been resolved. In order to determine whether the petitioner was a true successor to Elvira Auto Body, counsel was instructed on appeal to fully explain the manner by which the petitioner took over the business of Elvira Auto Body and to provide the Service with a copy of the contract or agreement between the two entities; however, no response was submitted. If the *petitioner's claim of having assumed all of Elvira Auto Body's rights, duties, obligations, etc.*, is found to be untrue, then grounds would exist for invalidation of the labor certification under 20 C.F.R. § 656.30 (1987). Conversely, if the claim is found to be true, and it is determined that an actual successorship exists, the petition could be approved if eligibility is otherwise shown, including ability of the predecessor enterprise to have paid the certified wage at the time of filing.

19 I&N Dec. at 482-83 (emphasis added).

The Commissioner's decision does not require a successor-in-interest to establish that it assumed all rights, duties, and obligations of its predecessor. Instead, in *Matter of Dial Auto*, the petitioner specifically represented that it had assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations, but failed to submit requested evidence to establish that this claim was, in fact, true. The Commissioner stated that if the petitioner's claim was untrue, the INS could invalidate the underlying labor certification for fraud or willful misrepresentation. For this reason the Commissioner said: "if the claim is found to be true, *and* it is determined that an actual successorship exists, the petition could be approved" *Id.* (emphasis added).

The Commissioner clearly considered the petitioner's claim that it had assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations to be a separate inquiry from whether or not the petitioner is a successor-in-interest. The Commissioner was most interested in receiving a full explanation as to the "manner by which the petitioner took over the business" and seeing a copy of "the contract or agreement between the two entities" in order to verify the petitioner's claims. *Id.* at 482.

Accordingly, *Matter of Dial Auto* does not stand for the proposition that a valid successor relationship may only be established through the assumption of "all" or a totality of a predecessor entity's rights,

duties, and obligations. Instead, the generally accepted definition of a successor-in-interest is broader: “[O]ne who follows another in ownership or control of property. A successor in interest retains the same rights as the original owner, with no change in substance.” *Black’s Law Dictionary* 1570 (defining “successor in interest”). A petitioner is not precluded from demonstrating a successor-in-interest relationship simply because it acquired a division of the predecessor entity instead of purchasing the predecessor in its entirety.

With respect to corporations, a successor is generally created when one corporation is vested with the rights and obligations of an earlier corporation through amalgamation, consolidation, or other assumption of interests.² *Id.* at 1569 (defining “successor”). When considering other business organizations, such as partnerships or sole proprietorships, even a partial change in ownership may require the petitioner to establish that it is a true successor-in-interest to the employer identified in the labor certification application. *See eg. Matter of United Investment Group*, 19 I&N Dec. 248 (Comm’r 1984).

The merger or consolidation of a business organization into another will give rise to a successor-in-interest relationship because the assets and obligations are transferred by operation of law. However, a mere transfer of assets or asset transaction, even one that takes up a predecessor’s business activities, does not necessarily create a successor-in-interest. *See Holland v. Williams Mountain Coal Co.*, 496 F.3d 670, 672 (D.C. Cir. 2007). An asset transaction occurs when one business organization sells property – such as real estate, machinery, or intellectual property - to another business organization. The purchase of assets from a predecessor will only result in a successor-in-interest relationship if the parties agree to the transfer and assumption of the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business.³ *See generally* 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2170 (2010).

Considering *Matter of Dial Auto* and the generally accepted definition of successor-in-interest, a petitioner may establish a valid successor relationship for immigration purposes if it satisfies three conditions. First, the petitioning successor must fully describe and document the transaction transferring

² Merger and acquisition transactions, in which the interests of two or more corporations become unified, may be arranged into four general groups. The first group includes “consolidations” that occur when two or more corporations are united to create one new corporation. The second group includes “mergers,” consisting of a transaction in which one of the constituent companies remains in being, absorbing the other constituent corporation. The third type of combination includes “reorganizations” that occur when the new corporation is the reincarnation or reorganization of one previously existing. The fourth group includes transactions in which a corporation, although continuing to exist as a “shell” legal entity, is in fact merged into another through the acquisition of its assets and business operations. 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2165 (2010).

³ The mere assumption of immigration obligations, or the transfer of immigration benefits derived from approved or pending immigration petitions or applications, will not give rise to a successor-in-interest relationship unless the transfer results from the bona fide acquisition of the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business. *See* 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2170; *see also* 20 C.F.R. § 656.12(a).

ownership of all, or the relevant parts of, the beneficiary's predecessor employer. Second, the petitioning successor must demonstrate that the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification. Third, the petitioning successor must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it can establish eligibility for the immigrant visa in all respects.

Evidence of transfer of ownership must show that the successor not only purchased assets from the predecessor, but also acquired the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business. To ensure that the job opportunity remains the same as originally certified, the successor must continue to operate the same type of business as the predecessor, in the same metropolitan statistical area, and the successor's essential business functions must remain substantially the same as before the ownership transfer. *See Matter of Dial Auto*, 19 I&N Dec. at 482.

In order to establish eligibility for the immigrant visa in all respects, the petitioner must support its claim with all necessary evidence, including evidence of ability to pay. The petitioning successor must prove the predecessor's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and until the date of transfer of ownership to the successor. In addition, the petitioner must establish its own ability to pay the proffered wage from the date of transfer of ownership forward. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2); *see also Matter of Dial Auto*, 19 I&N Dec. at 482.

Applying the analysis set forth above to the instant petition, the petitioner has not established a valid successor-in-interest relationship with the company that filed the labor certification. While the AAO's RFE specifically asked for documentation regarding the formation of the petitioning company and its relationship with the company that filed the labor certification, it is noted that the petitioner responded by providing only pages "1" and "17" of its "Limited Liability Company Agreement" which were filed in conjunction with the petitioner's formation as an LLC in Delaware on June 5, 2009.⁴

The petitioner further provided a copy of a bill of sale dated July 11, 2009, detailing the transfer of assets from the company that filed the labor certificate to the petitioner. However, this document evidences the sale of assets such as saws, tools, and other construction equipment, office furniture and computer equipment. There is nothing in this document establishing that the transaction transferred all, or the relevant parts of, the company that filed the labor certification, or that the petitioner also acquired the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business.

Finally, the petitioner also provided copies of numerous invoices that suggest the petitioning company is involved in construction. However, these invoices do not establish that the petitioner is operating the

⁴ On appeal, counsel states that the petitioning company survived as the successor-in-interest to the company that filed the labor certification due to the restructuring that occurred in 2009. However, the evidence does not support counsel's assertion that the incorporation of the petitioner in 2009 was a restructuring of the initial company, which was owned in 2008 by [REDACTED] into the successor company, which was owned in 2009 by [REDACTED] according to the tax returns of the respective companies.

same type of business, with essentially the same business functions as the company that filed the labor certification.⁵ In light of the evidence, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it is successor-in-interest to the company that filed the labor certification.

As the petitioner has not established that it is the successor-in-interest to the company that filed the labor certification application, the petition is not accompanied by a valid labor certification and must be denied. The regulations at 8 C.F.R. §§ 204.5(a)(2) and 204.5(l)(3)(i) require that any Form I-140 petition filed under the preference category of section 203(b)(3) of the Act be accompanied by a labor certification. A labor certification for a specific job offer is valid only for the particular job opportunity, the alien for whom the certification was granted, and for the area of intended employment stated on the Form ETA 750. 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(c)(2). The petitioner did not file the labor certification application in support of the Form I-140 petition in this case. Thus, the petition must be denied.

Further, the petitioner has not established the ability to pay in this case. Even if the petitioner had established it was a successor-in-interest to the company that filed the labor certificate, the petitioner would have to show that the *predecessor* had the ability to pay the proffered wage from the March 16, 2009, priority date, until the July 11, 2009, date of the sales agreement, and that the *petitioner* had the ability to pay the proffered wage thereafter. The regulation 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states that the petitioner must demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage “at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence,” and that the evidence of ability to pay “shall be in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.” (Emphasis added).

The record does not contain the 2009 tax return or any other prescribed financial record for Brooks Palmer Custom Homes, Inc., to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage from March 16, 2009, through July 11, 2009. Therefore, the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage since the priority date has not been established. The petitioner’s failure to provide this evidence is, by itself, sufficient cause to dismiss this appeal. While additional evidence may be submitted to establish the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage, it may not be substituted for evidence required by regulation. Failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). 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)).

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial.⁶ 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.

⁵ The 2009 IRS Form 1065 indicates that the petitioner’s primary business is [REDACTED]. The 2008 IRS Form 1120S of [REDACTED], indicates that its primary business is [REDACTED].

⁶ When the AAO denies a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

only if it is shown that the AAO abused its discretion with respect to all of the AAO's enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 299 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683.