


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly 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**



B6

FILE: [REDACTED]

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

NOV 16 2010

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

PETITION: Immigrant petition for Alien Worker as an Other, Unskilled Worker 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. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently \$585, but will increase to \$630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the \$630 fee. 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, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter was before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a nursing home. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a nursing aide pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3) as an other, unskilled worker. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750), approved by the Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary met the minimum requirements at the time the request for certificate was accepted. Therefore, the director denied the petition.

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.

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>

As set forth in the director's January 14, 2009 denial, the primary issue in this case is whether or not the beneficiary possessed the certified nurse assistant (CNA) certificate prior to the priority date as set forth on the Form ETA 750.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii), 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 unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have the education and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's filing date, which is February 11, 2003. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

The key to determining the job qualifications is found on Form ETA-750 Part A. This section of the application for alien labor certification describes the terms and conditions of the job offered. It is important that the ETA-750 be read as a whole. The instructions for the Form ETA 750A, item 14, provide:

---

<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). The AAO notes that the petitioner filed a motion to reconsider with the director prior to the instant appeal on the basis of ineffective assistance of counsel and will adjudicate the instant appeal on its merits.

***Minimum Education, Training, and Experience Required to Perform the Job Duties.*** Do not duplicate the time requirements. For example, time required in training should not also be listed in education or experience. Indicate whether months or years are required. Do not include restrictive requirements which are not actual business necessities for performance on the job and which would limit consideration of otherwise qualified U.S. workers.

Moreover, when determining whether a beneficiary is eligible for a preference immigrant visa, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. USCIS must examine “the language of the labor certification job requirements” in order to determine what the job requires. *Id.* 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. *See 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 alien employment certification application form. *See id.* at 834. USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that DOL has formally issued or otherwise attempt to divine the employer’s intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

In this case, the item 14 of the Form ETA 750A requires a “CNA Certificate” for the proffered position. The petitioner did not submit a CNA certificate for the beneficiary. In visa petition proceedings, the burden is on the petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit sought. *See Matter of Brantigan*, 11 I&N Dec. 493 (BIA 1966). The petitioner must prove by a preponderance of evidence that the beneficiary is fully qualified for the benefit sought. *Matter of Martinez*, 21 I&N Dec. 1035, 1036 (BIA 1997); *Matter of Patel*, 19 I&N Dec. 774 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Soo Hoo*, 11 I&N Dec. 151 (BIA 1965). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states that the director may request additional evidence in appropriate cases. Although specifically and clearly requested by the director, the petitioner declined to provide the beneficiary’s CNA certificate. The petitioner’s failure to submit this document cannot be excused. The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

On appeal, counsel asserts that the training required in item 14 of the Form ETA 750A should be logically interpreted to mean “CNA certification or equivalent.” However, the Form ETA 750 does not specify the minimum training requirement of a CNA Certificate might be met through an equivalent. The labor certification application, as certified, does not demonstrate that the petitioner would accept an equivalent of a CNA Certificate when DOL oversaw the petitioner’s labor market test. Counsel did not submit any evidence of the petitioner’s intent concerning the actual minimum training requirements of the position as that intent was explicitly and specifically expressed to DOL while that agency oversaw the labor market test and determination of the actual minimum training requirements set forth on the certified labor certification application. Such intent may have been illustrated through correspondence with DOL, amendments to the labor certification application

initiated by DOL and the petitioner, results of recruitment, or other forms of evidence relevant and probative to illustrating the petitioner's intent about the actual minimum training requirements of the proffered position and that those minimum requirements were clear to potential qualified candidates during the labor market test.

In addition, counsel did not submit any evidence to support his interpretation on appeal. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). 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)). A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm. 1988). Therefore, counsel's assertion on appeal cannot overcome the ground of the director's denial that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary possessed a CNA Certificate prior to the priority date and thus, met the minimum training requirement for the proffered position. The petition cannot be approved and the denial of the petition must be affirmed.

Beyond the director's decision and counsel's assertions on appeal, the AAO has identified an additional ground of ineligibility and will discuss whether or not the petitioner has established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. 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*, 299 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a de novo basis).

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 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 as certified by the DOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was initially accepted on February 11, 2003. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$9.70 per hour (\$20,176 per year). On the petition, the petitioner claims that it has been in the business since 1999, and has an annual gross income of \$530,000, net annual income of \$125,137 and 10 employees. The beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner on the Form ETA 750B.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of a Form ETA 750 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the Form 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. Comm. 1977); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In evaluating whether a job offer is realistic, 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. Comm. 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. The petitioner did not submit any evidence showing that it paid the beneficiary any compensation for the years 2003 through the present. The petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage through examination of wages actually paid to the beneficiary for the years 2003 through the present. Therefore, the petitioner must demonstrate that it had sufficient net income or net current assets to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage for these relevant years.

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). 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). Reliance on the petitioner's wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

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 evidence in the record indicates the petitioner is structured as a partnership and filed its tax returns on IRS Form 1065, U.S. Return of Partnership Income. According to the tax returns, the petitioner’s fiscal year is based on a calendar year. The record contains copies of the petitioner’s Form 1065 for 2003 through 2007. The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate the following financial information concerning the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage of \$20,176 per year from the priority date:

- In 2003, the Form 1065 stated net income<sup>2</sup> of (\$24,366).
- In 2004, the Form 1065 stated net income of (\$24,442).
- In 2005, the Form 1065 stated net income of (\$14,127).
- In 2006, the Form 1065 stated net income of \$125,137.
- In 2007, the Form 1065 stated net income of \$38,454.

---

<sup>2</sup> Where a partnership’s income is exclusively from a trade or business, USCIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on Line 22 of page one of the petitioner’s Form 1065. The instructions on the Form 1065, U.S. Partnership Income, state on page one, “Caution, Include only trade or business income and expenses on lines 1a through 22.” Where a partnership has income from sources other than from a trade or business, net income is found on Schedule K. The Schedule K (pages 3-4 of Form 1065) is a summary schedule of all the partners’ shares of the partnership’s income, credits, deductions, etc. The net income is reported on Analysis of Net Income (Loss) line 1 Net income (loss) on page 4 of Form 1065. See Internal Revenue Service, Instructions for Form 1065, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1065.pdf>.

While the petitioner had sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage in 2006 and 2007, the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the instant beneficiary the proffered wage with its net income for 2003 through 2005.

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 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 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.<sup>3</sup> A partnership's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L to the Form 1065, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 15 through 17. If the total of a partnership'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 the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$20,176 per year for 2003 through 2005:

- In 2003, the Form 1065 stated net current assets of \$15,113.
- In 2004, the Form 1065 stated net income of \$76,065.
- In 2005, the Form 1065 stated net income of \$67,145.

While the petitioner had sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage in 2004 and 2005, the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the instant beneficiary the proffered wage with its net current assets for 2003, the year of the priority date.

If the instant petition were the only petition filed by the petitioner, the petitioner would be required to produce evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage to the single beneficiary of the instant petition. However, where a petitioner has filed multiple petitions for multiple beneficiaries which have been pending or approved simultaneously, the petitioner must produce evidence that its job offers to each beneficiary are realistic, and therefore, that it has the ability to pay the proffered wages to each of the beneficiaries of its pending and approved petitions, as of the priority date of each

---

<sup>3</sup> According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3<sup>rd</sup> 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.

petition and continuing until the beneficiary of each petition obtains lawful permanent residence. *See Mater of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977) (petitioner must establish ability to pay as of the date of the Form MA 7-50B job offer, the predecessor to the Form ETA 750 and ETA Form 9089). *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

In the instant case, USCIS records show that the petitioner filed additional Immigrant Petitions for Alien Worker (Form I-140) for four workers (two were approved and the other two were denied).<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the petitioner is obligated to demonstrate its ability to pay two additional proffered wages for 2006 through 2008 before it establishes its ability to pay the instant beneficiary the proffered wage. The record does not contain any documentary evidence showing that the petitioner paid those two beneficiaries any compensation in these relevant years. In 2006, the petitioner had net income of \$125,137 and net current assets of \$37,168. The petitioner's net income was sufficient to pay the three proffered wages<sup>5</sup> it was responsible for that year. However, in 2007, neither the petitioner's net income of \$38,454 nor net current assets of \$22,523 were sufficient to pay the two proffered wages to the beneficiaries of the approved petitions and further not sufficient to pay the instant beneficiary the proffered wage. The record does not contain any regulatory-prescribed evidence, such as annual reports, tax returns or audited financial statements, for 2008. Without any of these regulatory-prescribed evidence, the AAO cannot determine whether the petitioner had sufficient net income or net current assets to pay all three proffered wages in 2008 and thus, establish its ability to pay all proffered wage that year.

Therefore, from the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL in 2003, the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay all proffered wage for the years 2003, 2007 and 2008.

A partnership consists of a general partner(s) and may also have limited partners. A general partner is personally liable for the partnership's total liabilities. As such, a general partner's personal assets may be utilized to show the ability to pay the proffered wage. However, a general partner's personal expenses and liabilities must also be examined in order to make a determination that his or her assets are truly available to pay the proffered wage. The record of proceeding does not contain enough information regarding the general partner's personal assets and expenses. As such, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the general partner's assets may be utilized to pay the proffered wage.

USCIS may also 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

---

<sup>4</sup> The detail information about the two approved petitions is as follows:

██████████ filed for Barrameda on August 2, 2007 with the priority date of August 16, 2006 and approved on November 24, 2008.

██████████ filed for Basanta on September 18, 2007 with the priority date of August 16, 2006 and approved on October 23, 2008.

<sup>5</sup> The record does not contain any information about the proffered wages for those two approved petitions, and therefore, the AAO assumes that the petitioner offered the proffered wage to those two beneficiaries at the same level with the instant beneficiary.

Dec. 612 (BIA 1967). The petitioning entity in *Sonegawa* 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 *Sonegawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonegawa*, 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's tax returns show that the petitioning business was not profitable for three out of five relevant years. No unusual circumstances have been shown to exist in this case to parallel those in *Sonegawa*, nor has it been established that all these three years were uncharacteristically unprofitable years for the petitioner. In addition, given the record as a whole, the petitioner's history of filing immigrant and nonimmigrant petitions, the AAO must also take into account the petitioner's ability to pay the petitioner's wages in the context of its overall recruitment efforts. 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 all proffered wages.

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.