

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearing of an unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



B5

FILE:  Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: **SEP 27 2010**

IN RE: Petitioner: 
Beneficiary: 

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

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 \$585. 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 Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner claims to be an IT consulting business. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a senior programmer analyst. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as an advanced degree professional pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2).¹

The petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The priority date of the petition is March 25, 2005, which is the date the labor certification was accepted for processing by the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

As set forth in the director's June 13, 2008 denial, the primary issue in this case is whether the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. The AAO will also consider whether the beneficiary meets the minimum requirements of the offered position as set forth in the labor certification.²

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 conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d at 145. The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.³

¹ Section 203(b)(2) of the Act provides immigrant classification to members of the professions holding advanced degrees or aliens of exceptional ability, whose services are sought by an employer in the United States. There is no evidence in the record of proceeding that the beneficiary possesses exceptional ability in the sciences, arts or business. Accordingly, consideration of the petition will be limited to whether the beneficiary is eligible for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree.

² 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*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

³ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, which are incorporated into the regulations by 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).

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. 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). The regulation 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states:

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.

Therefore, the petitioner must establish that it has possessed the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the March 25, 2005 priority date.

The proffered wage stated on the labor certification is \$63,565 per year. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 2002, to have a gross annual income of \$632,847.00, and to employ eight workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner is structured as a C corporation with a fiscal year based on a calendar year.

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) will first examine whether the petitioner employed the beneficiary during the required period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it paid the beneficiary 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. If the petitioner has not paid the beneficiary wages that are at least equal to the proffered wage for the required period, the petitioner must establish that it could pay the difference between the wages actually paid to the beneficiary, if any, and the proffered wage.

On the labor certification, signed by the beneficiary under penalty of perjury, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner since June 2004. The record contains the beneficiary's Forms W-2, Wage and Tax Statement, for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. These documents state the wages paid to the beneficiary by the petitioner, as shown in the table below.

Year	Wages Paid (\$)	Shortfall (\$)
2005	21,318.00	42,247.00
2006	36,250.00	27,315.00
2007	46,875.00	16,690.00
2008	55,635.00	7,930.00
2009	54,180.00	9,385.00

Therefore, for the years 2005 through 2009, the petitioner did not pay the beneficiary an amount equal to or greater than the proffered wage. The petitioner must establish that it can pay the

difference between wages paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage.

If the petitioner does not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage each year during the required 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 (1st Cir. 2009). The petitioner must establish that it had sufficient net income to pay the difference between the wage paid, if any, and the proffered wage. 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. 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). Reliance on the petitioner's gross sales and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross sales exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner's total payroll exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient.

In *K.C.P. Food*, 623 F. Supp. at 1084, the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now 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. The court specifically rejected the argument that the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income.

With respect to depreciation, the court in *River Street Donuts* noted:

The AAO recognized that a depreciation deduction is a systematic allocation of the cost of a tangible long-term asset and does not represent a specific cash expenditure during the year claimed. Furthermore, the AAO indicated that the allocation of the depreciation of a long-term asset could be spread out over the years or concentrated into a few depending on the petitioner's choice of accounting and depreciation methods. Nonetheless, the AAO explained that depreciation represents an actual cost of doing business, which could represent either the diminution in value of buildings and equipment or the accumulation of funds necessary to replace perishable equipment and buildings. Accordingly, the AAO stressed that even though amounts deducted for depreciation do not represent current use of cash, neither does it represent amounts available to pay wages.

We find that the AAO has a rational explanation for its policy of not adding depreciation back to net income. Namely, that the amount spent on a long term tangible asset is a "real" expense.

River Street Donuts at 116. "[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." *Chi-Feng Chang* at 537 (emphasis added).

The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for the required period, as shown in the table below.⁴

Year	Net Income (\$)
2005	56,882.00
2006	13,813.00
2007	76,565.00
2008	34,558.00
2009	Not Provided ⁵

Therefore, in 2006 and 2009, the petitioner did not establish that it had sufficient net income to pay the difference between the wage paid and the 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 are not considered in the determination of the ability to pay the proffered wage. 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

⁴ The petitioner filed its tax returns using Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of Form 1120.

⁵ The AAO issued a Request for Evidence (RFE), instructing the petitioner to submit its federal tax returns for 2007, 2008, and, if available, 2009. The petitioner filed its response on April 13, 2010. By that date, the petitioner's 2009 federal tax return would have been due. *See* <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120.pdf> (accessed August 19, 2010). There is evidence in the record that the petitioner requested an extension to file its 2009 tax return. However, 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 petitioner's failure to provide evidence responsive to the RFE and in compliance with the regulations 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)).

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.⁶ If the total of a corporation's end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net current assets for the required period, as shown in the table below.⁷

Year	Net Current Assets (\$)
2006	841.00
2009	Not provided

For the years 2006 and 2009, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the difference between the wage paid and the proffered wage.

Therefore, except for 2005, 2007 and 2008, the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets.

The record contains copies of the petitioner's bank statements. Counsel's reliance on the balances in the petitioner's bank account 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 or the cash specified on the petitioner's tax return used in determining the petitioner's net current assets. Fourth, bank statements, without more, are unreliable indicators of ability to pay because they do not identify funds that are already obligated for other purposes.

⁶ According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3rd 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 accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

⁷ On Form 1120, USCIS considers current assets to be the sum of Lines 1 through 6 on Schedule L, and current liabilities to be the sum of Lines 16 through 18.

The record also contains copies of the petitioner's unaudited financial statements for the years ended 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) makes clear that where a petitioner relies on financial statements to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage, those financial statements must be audited. An audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards to obtain a reasonable assurance that the financial statements of the business are free of material misstatements. The unsupported representations of management are not reliable evidence and are insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage.⁸

The record contains a "Shareholder reaffirmation of commitment and pledge of personal funds" signed by the company's President and Vice President. The document states that the signatories "pledge their personal assets to ensure sufficient capital is available for corporate expansion and the hiring of additional consultants at competitive rates of pay." A future pledge of payment does nothing to alter the immediate eligibility of the instant petition. A petition may not be approved based on speculation of future eligibility or after the petitioner becomes eligible under a new set of facts. See *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm. 1971). Further, USCIS does not look to the assets of the corporation's owners to satisfy the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. It is an elementary rule that a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders. See *Matter of M*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958), *Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980), and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980). Consequently, assets of a corporation's officers, shareholders or other corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. In *Sitar v. Ashcroft*, 2003 WL 22203713 (D.Mass. Sept. 18, 2003), the court stated, "nothing in the governing regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 204.5, permits [USCIS] to consider the financial resources of individuals or entities who have no legal obligation to pay the wage."

The petitioner also recommends the use of retained earnings to pay the proffered wage. Retained earnings are a company's accumulated earnings since its inception less dividends. *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 378 (3rd ed. 2000). As retained earnings are cumulative, adding retained earnings to net income and/or net current assets is duplicative. Therefore, USCIS looks at each particular year's net income, rather than the cumulative total of the previous years' net incomes less dividends represented by the line item of retained earnings. Even if considered separately from net income and net current assets, retained earnings might not be included appropriately in the calculation of the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage because retained earnings do not necessarily represent funds available for use. Retained earnings can be either appropriated or unappropriated. *Id.* Appropriated retained earnings are set aside for specific uses, such as reinvestment or asset acquisition, and as such, are not available for shareholder dividends or other uses. *Id.* at 27. The record does not demonstrate that the petitioner's retained earnings are unappropriated and are cash or current assets that would be available to pay the proffered wage.

⁸ It is noted that the unaudited financial statement characterizes over \$75,000 in accounts receivable as a current asset, but the petitioner identified this asset as an "other asset" on its 2006 Schedule L.

In addition to the preceding analysis, 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. 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 claims to have been in business since 2002 and to employ 8 employees.⁹ The petitioner's tax returns show gross sales of \$687,115 in 2005, \$632,847 in 2006, \$1,262,692 in 2007 and \$2,710,503 in 2008. The record contains copies of recent invoices and payments. This is not sufficient to demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner has not established the existence of any unusual circumstances to parallel those in *Sonogawa*. There is no evidence in the record of the historical growth of the petitioner's business or the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses in 2006. There is no evidence of the petitioner's reputation within its industry. There is no evidence of whether the beneficiary will

⁹ The petitioner's 2009 Forms 941, Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return, state that the petitioner has "0" employees, but that it paid wages, tips and other compensation of approximately \$950,000 for the year. The record also contains a copy of a 2009 Form W-2 issued to the beneficiary. Forms W-2 are issued to employees, not independent contractors. Therefore, the documents submitted by the petitioner to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage are inconsistent. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Id.* at 591.

be replacing a former employee or an outsourced service.

Further, it is noted that the petitioner has filed an immigrant petition on behalf of another beneficiary.¹⁰ Where a petitioner has filed multiple petitions for multiple beneficiaries which have been pending simultaneously, the petitioner must establish that its job offers to each beneficiary are realistic, and therefore, that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage to each beneficiary as of the priority date of each petition and continuing until each beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. at 144. The record in the instant case contains no information about the priority date and proffered wage for the beneficiary of the other petition, whether the beneficiary has withdrawn from the petition process, or whether the petitioner has withdrawn its job offer to the beneficiary. There is also no information in the record about whether the petitioner has employed that beneficiary or the wages paid to the beneficiary, if any. Thus, the petitioner has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage for the beneficiary or the proffered wages to the beneficiary of the other petition.

Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this case, it is concluded that the evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has also not established that the beneficiary possessed all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the priority date. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). *See also Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971). In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. 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, Mandany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coorney*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

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). 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.

Even though the labor certification may be prepared with the alien in mind, USCIS has an independent role in determining whether the alien meets the labor certification requirements. *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. Nov. 30, 2006). Thus, where the plain language of those requirements does not support the petitioner's asserted intent, USCIS

¹⁰ [REDACTED]

"does not err in applying the requirements as written." *Id.* at *7.

The minimum education, training, experience and skills required to perform the duties of the offered position is set forth at Part A of the labor certification. In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered senior programmer analyst position has the following minimum requirements:

EDUCATION: "M.S." in computer science, engineering or equivalent field of study. "Will accept B.S. and 5 years experience in lieu of M.S. and 1 year experience."

TRAINING: None

EXPERIENCE: One (1) year in the job offered or in the related occupation of "IT Consulting Experience" consisting of Oracle and Java.

OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: None

The beneficiary possesses a four-year bachelor of technology in mechanical engineering from [REDACTED]. The evidence in the record is sufficient to establish that the beneficiary possesses a foreign degree that is equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree in engineering. In order for the beneficiary to qualify for the offered position, the petitioner must also establish that the beneficiary possesses five years of experience in the job offered or in IT consulting. To that end, the record contains two letters describing the beneficiary's prior employment experience.

Evidence relating to qualifying experience shall be in the form of letters from current or former employers and shall include the name, address, and title of the writer, and a specific description of the duties performed by the beneficiary. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(1).

The first letter, authored by [REDACTED] is dated June 16, 2004. The letter states that the company employed the beneficiary as a Programmer/Analyst from September 1999 until June 2004. The letter states that the beneficiary was employed on a full-time basis, used Oracle and Java, and provides a description of the duties performed by the beneficiary.

The second letter, authored by [REDACTED] is dated August 29, 1999. The letter states that the company employed the beneficiary as a Programmer Analyst from February 1996 to August 1999. The letter does not state whether the employment was full-time, does not describe the duties performed by the beneficiary, and stated dates of employment that differ from the dates stated on the labor certification. Again, the petitioner must resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 591-92. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Id.* at 591.

In light of the above, the letter of [REDACTED] is not sufficient to establish the beneficiary's

employment experience with [REDACTED]. Therefore, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary has the five years of experience required by the labor certification.¹¹

The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary possesses the qualifications required to perform the proffered position. 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)).

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the director does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. When the AAO denies a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge 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*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1043.

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.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

¹¹ In addition, in order to obtain classification in the requested preference category, the petitioner must establish that the beneficiary is a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2), defines "advanced degree" as follows:

[A]ny United States academic or professional degree or a foreign equivalent degree above that of baccalaureate. A United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree followed by at least five years of progressive experience in the specialty shall be considered the equivalent of a master's degree. If a doctoral degree is customarily required by the specialty, the alien must have a United States doctorate or a foreign equivalent degree.

The petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary obtained five years of progressive experience in the specialty. Therefore, the beneficiary does not meet the definition of an advanced degree professional, and the petition cannot be approved for this reason as well.