



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: JUN 21 2013 OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

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

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The matter will be rejected pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii)(B).

The petitioner is a skilled nursing facility. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a physical therapist aide. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner failed to submit the required initial evidence, and, therefore, 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 failed to establish that the beneficiary was qualified for the proffered position. The director 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.

The AAO notes that the Form ETA 750 and Form I-140 were filed by [REDACTED]. The tax identification number listed on the Form I-140 is [REDACTED]. This is the same tax identification number listed on the 2004 through 2009 federal tax returns/tax return transcripts submitted for [REDACTED]. The address listed on the Form ETA 750, Form I-140 and federal tax returns/tax return transcripts is [REDACTED], San Jose, CA [REDACTED]. However, the Form I-290B was filed by [REDACTED] whose address is [REDACTED] Bakersfield, CA [REDACTED]. The AAO notes that this is not the correct party to file an appeal in this matter and the appeal will be rejected on this basis. The AAO will address whether [REDACTED] is a successor-in-interest to [REDACTED].

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 *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>1</sup> *Id.* at 1569 (defining "successor"). When considering other business

---

<sup>1</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

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>2</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>3</sup> *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 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.

---

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>2</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>3</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-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).

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, [REDACTED] has not established a valid successor relationship for immigration purposes. [REDACTED] has not described nor documented at all the transaction transferring ownership of all, or a relevant part of, the beneficiary's predecessor employer. [REDACTED] has not presented any evidence that the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification. Lastly, [REDACTED] has not proved by a preponderance of the evidence that it is eligible for the immigrant visa in all respects. There is no documentation in the record related to [REDACTED] ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage.

The AAO will therefore reject the appeal as the party that filed the appeal, [REDACTED] is not the proper party to file the appeal. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) regulations and precedent decisions specifically limit the filing of an appeal to the affected party, i.e., in the instant case, the petitioner. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii)(B).

The AAO notes that even if it did not reject the decision, it would dismiss the appeal as the I-140 petitioner has not established it has the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage from the June 18, 2004 priority date pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

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). If the petitioner's net income or net current assets is not sufficient to demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS may also consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's business activities. *See Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg'l Comm'r 1967).

According to USCIS records the petitioner has filed 220 I-140 petitions on behalf of other beneficiaries. Accordingly, the petitioner must establish that it has had the continuing ability to pay the combined proffered wages to each beneficiary from the priority date of the instant petition. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977). The evidence in the record does not document for all 220 petitions the priority date, proffered wage or wages paid to each beneficiary, whether any of the other petitions have been withdrawn, revoked, or denied, or whether any of the other beneficiaries have obtained lawful permanent residence. This issue must be addressed before it can be determined that the petitioner is able to pay the proffered wage in any year. Similarly, the AAO cannot determine whether *Matter of Sonogawa* should be positively applied without information related to the petitioner's other sponsored workers.<sup>4</sup>

The petition will be denied for the above stated reason. 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 rejected as improperly filed.

---

<sup>4</sup> The AAO notes that the petitioner must also establish in any other filings that it will be the actual employer of the beneficiary. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(c); 20 C.F.R. § 656.3.