






U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)




Date: **MAY 07 2012** Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE: 

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 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,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cook. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). With the exception of Form ETA 750, the petition was submitted without any of the supporting documents required pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3). The director determined that the petitioner had not submitted the requisite initial evidence and denied the petition pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(ii).

In issuing his decision, the director indicated that by failing to provide the required initial evidence, 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; that the beneficiary had the required experience as stipulated on the labor certification; or that the petitioner was a successor-in-interest to the business which filed the labor certification.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and 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 January 26, 2009 denial, the first 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)(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.

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 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 Form ETA 750, Application for Alien 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 Form ETA 750, Application for Alien 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).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on September 20, 2002. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$9.65 per hour (\$20,072 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the job offered.

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.<sup>1</sup>

On appeal, counsel submits a brief; the U.S. Individual Income Tax Return (Form 1040) filed by [REDACTED] for 2007; and an undated letter from [REDACTED]

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a sole proprietorship. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1987 and currently to employ 11 workers. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on September 17, 2002, the beneficiary does not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

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'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).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary during that period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. On Form ETA 750B, the beneficiary does not claim to have worked for the petitioner. Further, the petitioner provided no evidence of having paid the

---

<sup>1</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).

beneficiary any wages at time since the priority date. Therefore, in the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date in 2002 onwards.

If the petitioner does not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage during that period, USCIS will next examine the net income figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. *River Street Donuts, LLC v. Napolitano*, 558 F.3d 111 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 2009); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010), *aff'd*, No. 10-1517 (6th Cir. filed Nov. 10, 2011). Reliance on federal income tax returns as a basis for determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is well established by judicial precedent. *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 (9th Cir. 1984)); *see also Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Texas 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 (7th Cir. 1983).

The petitioner is a sole proprietorship, a business in which one person operates the business in his or her personal capacity. Black's Law Dictionary 1398 (7th Ed. 1999). Unlike a corporation, a sole proprietorship does not exist as an entity apart from the individual owner. *See Matter of United Investment Group*, 19 I&N Dec. 248, 250 (Comm'r 1984). Therefore the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income, assets and personal liabilities are also considered as part of the petitioner's ability to pay. Sole proprietors report income and expenses from their businesses on their individual (Form 1040) federal tax return each year. The business-related income and expenses are reported on Schedule C and are carried forward to the first page of the tax return. Sole proprietors must show that they can cover their existing business expenses as well as pay the proffered wage out of their adjusted gross income or other available funds. In addition, sole proprietors must show that they can sustain themselves and their dependents. *See Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

In *Ubeda*, 539 F. Supp. at 650, the court concluded that it was highly unlikely that a petitioner could support himself, his spouse and five dependents on a gross income of slightly more than \$20,000 where the beneficiary's proposed salary was \$6,000 or approximately thirty percent (30%) of the petitioner's gross income.

In the instant case, the sole proprietor supports a family of five. The proprietor's tax returns reflect the following information for the following years:

- The petitioner submitted no tax return for 2002.
- The petitioner submitted no tax return for 2003.
- The petitioner submitted no tax return for 2004.
- The petitioner submitted no tax return for 2005.
- The petitioner submitted no tax return for 2006.

- In 2007, the proprietor's IRS Form 1040, line 37, stated adjusted gross income of \$38,970.00.

The sole proprietor has provided no evidence of its adjusted gross income for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 or 2006 and, therefore, has not demonstrated the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage for those years. In 2007, the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income is sufficient to pay the beneficiary the full proffered wage. However, the sole proprietor must be able not only to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage but also to support his family. In deducting the proffered wage (\$20,072) from the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income (\$38,970) for 2007, the petitioner is left with \$18,970 with which to support his family of five. The petitioner has not provided a list of recurring, monthly expenses for which he is responsible (i.e. personal liabilities). However, the petitioner has not demonstrated and it is not likely that he would be able to support a family of five on \$18,970. Therefore, the petitioner has not demonstrated the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage for any year from 2002 through 2007.

On appeal, counsel merely indicates that the sole proprietor's tax return for 2007 demonstrates its ability to pay. Counsel, however, provided no other evidence in support of his assertion. Further, counsel provided no evidence of the sole proprietor's personal, unencumbered and liquefiable assets that could reasonably be applied towards paying employee wages.

USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's business activities in its determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. See *Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg'l Comm'r 1967). The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about \$100,000. During the year in which the petition was filed in that case, the petitioner changed business locations and paid rent on both the old and new locations for five months. There were large moving costs and also a period of time when the petitioner was unable to do regular business. The Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner's prospects for a resumption of successful business operations were well established. The petitioner was a fashion designer whose work had been featured in *Time* and *Look* magazines. Her clients included Miss Universe, movie actresses, and society matrons. The petitioner's clients had been included in the lists of the best-dressed California women. The petitioner lectured on fashion design at design and fashion shows throughout the United States and at colleges and universities in California. The Regional Commissioner's determination in *Sonogawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonogawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to the 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 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 relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In the instant case, the petitioner provided a tax return for one year only with no other supporting financial documentation. The petitioner has not established the historical growth of the petitioning

business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry or whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service. 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.

As set forth in the director's January 26, 2009 denial, the second issue in this case is whether or not the beneficiary has the minimum of two years of experience required to perform the offered position by the priority date.

The beneficiary must meet all of the requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification by the priority date of the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977); *see also Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

In evaluating the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant*, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm. 1986). *See also, Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *See also Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008; *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006; *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

Where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by regulation, USCIS must examine "the language of the labor certification job requirements" in order to determine what the petitioner must demonstrate about the beneficiary's qualifications. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. The only rational manner by which USCIS can be expected to interpret the meaning of terms used to describe the requirements of a job in a labor certification is to "examine the certified job offer *exactly* as it is completed by the prospective employer." *Rosedale Linden Park Company v. Smith*, 595 F. Supp. 829, 833 (D.D.C. 1984)(emphasis added). USCIS's interpretation of the job's requirements, as stated on the labor certification must involve "reading and applying *the plain language* of the [labor certification]." *Id.* at 834 (emphasis added). USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification or otherwise attempt to divine the employer's intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered position has the following minimum requirements:

EDUCATION

Grade School: None

High School: None

College: None

College Degree Required: None

Major Field of Study: None

TRAINING: None Required

EXPERIENCE: Two (2) years in the job offered

OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: None.

The labor certification also states that the beneficiary qualifies for the offered position based on experience as a cook at [REDACTED] California from September 2002 until the date upon which Form ETA 750B was signed, September 17, 2002. No other experience is listed. The beneficiary signed the labor certification under a declaration that the contents are true and correct under penalty of perjury.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(A) states:

Any requirements of training or experience for skilled workers, professionals, or other workers must be supported by letters from trainers or employers giving the name, address, and title of the trainer or employer, and a description of the training received or the experience of the alien.

The record contains an experience letter from an individual whose first name is [REDACTED] but whose last name is illegible. The letter is undated and bears the name "[REDACTED]" at the top. According to the letter, "[the beneficiary] worked for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] during the periods of February 1998 through June 2000 working and developing skills as a cook."

The letter does not appear to have been drafted upon official company letterhead. The name [REDACTED] appears to have been printed on the top of the letter by either an ink jet printer or a laser jet printer. The letter does not bear a company address or phone number and does not identify the name or title of the individual who drafted it. The letter identifies duties which the beneficiary was supposed to have performed. However, the author does not indicate whether the beneficiary worked on a full-time basis. Further, the record of proceeding contains another I-140 Immigrant Petition for an Alien Worker which the same petitioner filed for the beneficiary on November 19, 2001.<sup>2</sup> With the earlier petition, the petitioner supplied Form G-325 which was completed but not signed by the beneficiary. On this document, the beneficiary claims to have worked for [REDACTED] as a cook from January 1995 through the present (the filing of the I-140 petition on November 19, 2001). Moreover, on Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on September 17, 2002, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for [REDACTED] from September 2002 until September 2002.

*Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988), states:

It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such

---

<sup>2</sup> WAC-02-045-57432 was denied, as abandoned on July 13, 2004.

inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice.

The petitioner has provided no independent, objective evidence demonstrating how or if he worked for both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] during the same period of time. The letter submitted as evidence of the beneficiary's experience claims that the beneficiary worked for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] from February 1998 until June 2000. However, on Form ETA 750B the beneficiary claims to have begun working for [REDACTED] in September 2002. Further, on Form G-325, submitted with the earlier petition, the beneficiary claims to have worked for the petitioner from January 1995 but made no such claim on Form ETA 750, though it would have been pertinent to his experiential claims. Because of these inconsistencies and the deficiencies with the actual document, and the lack of independent, objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies, the letter supplied as evidence is not found to be credible.

Therefore, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary has the two years of experience in the job offered which are required by the terms of the labor certification and for classification as a skilled worker.

On appeal, counsel merely asserts that the letter submitted as evidence demonstrates the beneficiary's experience in the proffered position. However, for the reasons articulated above, the letter was not found to be credible. Counsel provided no additional evidence in support of his assertion.

As set forth in the director's January 26, 2009 denial, the third issue this case is whether or not the petitioner has demonstrated that it is a successor-in-interest to the company which filed Form ETA 750.

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.

In this instance, the petitioner supplied a labor certification. However, this document was certified for [REDACTED] and not for the petitioner.

A petitioner may only use a labor certification which was certified for an entity other than itself if the petitioner demonstrates that it is a successor-in-interest to the entity which filed the labor certification.

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 Repair Shop, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 481 (Comm'r 1986) ("*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.

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 482-3 (emphasis added).

In the present matter, the USCIS Nebraska Service Center Director noted that the petitioner supplied a labor certification which was filed by another organization and indicated that the petitioner provided no evidence of any sort demonstrating that a successorship took place. The Commissioner's decision does not require a successor-in-interest to establish that it assumed all rights, duties, and obligations. 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.*

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: “One 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 (9th ed. 2009) (defining “successor in interest”).

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.<sup>3</sup> *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.<sup>4</sup>

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, 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.<sup>5</sup> *See generally* 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2170 (2010).

---

<sup>3</sup> 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).

<sup>4</sup> For example, unlike a corporation with its own distinct legal identity, if a general partnership adds a partner after the filing of a labor certification application, a Form I-140 filed by what is essentially a new partnership must contain evidence that this partnership is a successor-in-interest to the filer of the labor certification application. *See Matter of United Investment Group*, 19 I&N Dec. 248 (Comm’r 1984). Similarly, if the employer identified in a labor certification application is a sole proprietorship, and the petitioner identified in the Form I-140 is a business organization, such as a corporation which happens to be solely owned by the individual who filed the labor certification application, the petitioner must nevertheless establish that it is a bona fide successor-in-interest.

<sup>5</sup> 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-

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 ownership of all, or a relevant part 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 is eligible 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 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 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 the successor's ability to pay the proffered wage in accordance 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 relationship for immigration purposes.

The petitioner provided no documentary evidence demonstrating any business transaction between [REDACTED] the company which filed Form ETA 750, and the petitioning business.

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'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg'l Comm'r 1972)).

Further, according to public records accessed through WestLaw, [REDACTED] is still registered to [REDACTED] the individual who signed Form ETA 750, and still continues to operate from [REDACTED], the same location as that which is identified on Form ETA 750. This information does not comport with a claimed successorship.

On appeal, counsel did not address this issue and provided no evidence to establish that a successorship had taken place.

---

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).

(b)(6)

Page 12

The petitioner has, therefore, not demonstrated that it is the successor-in-interest to the company which filed Form ETA 750 and for this reason may not utilize the labor certification to petition the beneficiary in this case.

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.