


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



B4

DATE: NOV 05 2012

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

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

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C)

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.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The decision of the director will be withdrawn and the appeal will be sustained.

The petitioner is a multinational corporation operating in the United States as a developer of resorts. At the time the petition was filed, the petitioner was a 108-person operation. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C), as a multinational executive or manager.

In a decision dated May 18, 2011, the director denied the petition based on the determination that the petitioner failed to establish that it had the ability to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage from the date the petition was filed.

On appeal, counsel submits an appellate brief as well as additional evidence, addressing the petitioner's ability to pay along with other factors pertaining to the petitioner's eligibility. Counsel properly pointed out that the regulations that require the petitioner to establish its ability to pay do not require that the beneficiary actually be paid the proffered wage when the petition is filed so long as the record shows that the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage at the time of filing.

In analyzing a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, the fundamental focus is whether the employer is making a "realistic" or credible job offer and has the financial ability to satisfy the proffered wage. *Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 145 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977).

The AAO finds that the petitioner has submitted sufficient evidence to overcome the sole basis for denial and that there are no other grounds for denying the petition.

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. The petitioner in the instant case has met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.