

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

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

B6

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

SEP 17 2010

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

[REDACTED]

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:

[REDACTED]

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

The petitioner is an engineering and construction advising company.<sup>1</sup> It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as project site manager (chairman and managing director). As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that 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. 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.

As set forth in the director's July 12, 2007 denial, the single 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 at 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 ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent 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 ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment

---

<sup>1</sup> The petitioner's tax returns state that its "product or service" is "employee leasing."

Certification, 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 ETA Form 9089 was accepted on August 9, 2006. The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$80,000 per year. The ETA Form 9089 states that the position requires an associate's degree, two years of experience, and specifies a number of other specific skills.

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>2</sup>

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as an S corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 2002 and to currently employ 12 workers.<sup>3</sup> On the ETA Form 9089, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner from February 1, 2003 to June 22, 2004.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA Form 9089 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA Form 9089, 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, 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. 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. In the instant case, the beneficiary stated that he

---

<sup>2</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).

<sup>3</sup> On the ETA Form 9089, the petitioner states that it employs 2 workers. "It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice." *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988).

worked for the petitioner before the ETA Form 9089 was filed. On appeal, counsel states that although the beneficiary is not technically employed by the petitioner, the petitioner pays the beneficiary's wage as a contractor through another company, [REDACTED]. In support of this statement, the petitioner submitted a Summary of Payments made to [REDACTED] for the beneficiary's services, wire transfer authorizations,<sup>4</sup> and copies of [REDACTED] bank statements reflecting the receipt of the wire transfers. The payment summary indicates that the petitioner transferred [REDACTED] in 2006 and [REDACTED] from January to August 2007. In comparing the payment summary to the wire transfer authorizations, which were only partially supplied for 2006, the wire transfer authorizations support the petitioner's payment summary for [REDACTED] in 2006 and [REDACTED] in 2007 to [REDACTED].<sup>5</sup> The bank statements of [REDACTED] indicated transfers made from the petitioner in the amount of [REDACTED] in 2006 and [REDACTED] in 2007.<sup>6</sup> The amounts transferred for which verification was provided are less than the proffered wage for 2006 and 2007. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). In addition, neither the wire transfer authorizations nor [REDACTED] bank statements indicated that the money being transferred from the petitioner was intended to cover the beneficiary's salary from [REDACTED] and not general work performed. Nor was any evidence introduced to show that the beneficiary received any of the transferred money as wage payments. No evidence was submitted regarding the beneficiary's salary received from [REDACTED] such as check stubs, Form 1099s, or W-2 forms. The petitioner's 2006 Form 1120S deductions do not indicate any labor or outside salary costs, but list [REDACTED] in "outside services;" no other line item was more than \$ [REDACTED]. This deduction does not indicate whether the beneficiary's salary was included in that line.

---

<sup>4</sup> As noted by counsel on appeal, the director erred in stating that the transfers were for the services of the individuals listed on the top of the authorization forms, the names in question appear in the section "Transmittal Information Submitted By" and are employees of the requesting organization. The wire transfer authorization contains no information indicating for what the payment is being made.

<sup>5</sup> The wire transfer authorizations were compared by date and amount to those listed on the payment summary. If the amount was different from that claimed on the payments summary (such as the December 8, 2006 payment listed on the summary as [REDACTED] and on the wire transfer authorization as [REDACTED] the amount was not counted in this analysis.

<sup>6</sup> We have used the amounts provided on the payment summary so long as they are reasonably close to the amount which appears on [REDACTED] bank statements after having been converted from British pounds to the U.S. dollar. To facilitate the conversion, we used an average of the monthly rate, found at <http://www.x-rates.com/d/GBP/USD/hist2006.htm> (accessed May 25, 2010) and <http://www.x-rates.com/d/GBP/USD/hist2007.htm>, (accessed May 25, 2010) for 2006 and 2007 respectively.

The only documentation of a relationship between the petitioner and [REDACTED] concerning the beneficiary is an affidavit signed by the beneficiary stating that he “has performed all work for [the petitioner] on behalf of [REDACTED]” Another affidavit, signed by the petitioner’s president, [REDACTED] states that the beneficiary will supply “exactly the same duties” to the petitioner as the duties listed in the affidavit consisting of “consulting services which have been provided by [the beneficiary] since September 2005.” These affidavits are insufficient to establish that the petitioner and [REDACTED] have an agreement whereby [REDACTED] lent the beneficiary to the petitioner in return for payment of the beneficiary’s wages. The beneficiary represents on ETA Form 9089 that he was the Chairman of [REDACTED]. His job duties indicate managing and directing the company rather than consulting on project work. The evidence in the record is insufficient to establish any relationship between the petitioner and [REDACTED] including any subcontractor relationship detailing the payment arrangement for the beneficiary’s wages. Nor does the evidence indicate the beneficiary’s duties with the petitioner or that the petitioner actually paid the beneficiary’s wages either directly or as billed separately including the beneficiary’s receipt of those wages. As a result, we are unable to conclude that the petitioner paid the amount of the full proffered wage during any relevant timeframe including the period from the priority date in 2006 or subsequently. 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)). As the record is not clear about the nature of the petitioner’s relationship with [REDACTED], we are unable to determine that the petitioner paid the proffered wage to the beneficiary in the relevant time.

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 gross receipts and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner’s gross receipts exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 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 USCIS 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* 558 F.3d 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*, 719 F.Supp. at 537 (emphasis added).

The record before the director closed on May 14, 2007 with the receipt by the director of the petitioner’s submissions in response to the director’s request for evidence. As of that date, the petitioner’s 2007 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner’s income tax return for 2006 is the most recent return available. The Form 1120S stated the petitioner’s net income<sup>7</sup> for 2006 as - [REDACTED] A loss is insufficient to establish the ability to pay the proffered wage.

As an alternate means of determining the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS may review the petitioner’s net current assets. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner’s current assets and current liabilities.<sup>8</sup> A corporation’s year-end current assets are shown

---

<sup>7</sup> Where an S corporation’s income is exclusively from a trade or business, USCIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner’s IRS Form 1120S. However, where an S corporation has income, credits, deductions or other adjustments from sources other than a trade or business, they are reported on Schedule K. Because the petitioner had no additions on its Schedule K, the petitioner’s net income is found on line 21 of its tax return.

<sup>8</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.

on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. 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 2006 Form 1120S demonstrates its end-of-year net current assets as - [REDACTED]. An end-of-year liability is insufficient to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

Therefore, from the date the ETA Form 9089 was accepted for processing by the DOL, the petitioner had 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.

Counsel asserts in his brief accompanying the appeal that there is another way to determine the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date. Specifically, counsel states that the information submitted on appeal demonstrates that the petitioner has been paying above the proffered wage for the beneficiary's services even though the beneficiary was a full-time employee of Technical Service instead of the petitioner.

Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax returns as submitted by the petitioner that demonstrates that the petitioner could not pay the proffered wage from the day the ETA Form 9089 was accepted for processing by the DOL.

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 (BIA 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 submitted no evidence showing that it has historically grown, that it has a sound business reputation, that it incurred uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, or any other factors to liken its situation to the one in *Sonegawa*. The petitioner's 2006 tax return lists \$0 in salaries paid, despite its statement on the Form I-140 that it employs 12 workers. The tax returns also reflect only [REDACTED] in gross receipts. 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.

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 director's decision, it is unclear that the petitioner will be the beneficiary's employer and was authorized to file the instant petition. 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 reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(c) provides that "[a]ny United States employer desiring and intending to employ an alien may file a petition for classification of the alien under...section 203(b)(3) of the Act." In addition, the Department of Labor (DOL) regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.3<sup>9</sup> states:

*Employer* means a person, association, firm, or a corporation which currently has a location within the United States to which U.S. workers may be referred for employment, and which proposes to employ a full-time worker at a place within the United States or the authorized representative of such a person, association, firm, or corporation.

In this case, the petitioner has failed to establish what company would actually employ the beneficiary. The petitioner describes itself as an "employment leasing" company and its tax returns reflect that it does not pay any employee salaries. The petitioner does not appear to employ anyone directly.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The regulatory scheme governing the alien labor certification process contains certain safeguards to assure that petitioning employers do not treat alien workers more favorably than U.S. workers. The current DOL regulations concerning labor certifications went into effect on March 28, 2005. The new regulations are referred to by the DOL by the acronym PERM. See 69 Fed. Reg. 77325, 77326 (Dec. 27, 2004). The PERM regulation was effective as of March 28, 2005, and applies to labor certification applications for the permanent employment of aliens filed on or after that date.

<sup>10</sup> USCIS records reflect that the beneficiary has been employed in E-2 status in an "executive position" as the Chairman and Managing Director for Technical Services, a company which he solely owns. Records further reflect that it was anticipated that the beneficiary would perform work

In determining whether there is an “employee-employer relationship,” the Supreme Court of the United States has determined that where a federal statute fails to clearly define the term “employee,” courts should conclude “that Congress intended to describe the conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine.” *Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. v. Darden*, 503 U.S. 318, 322-323 (1992) (hereinafter “*Darden*”) (quoting *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. 730 (1989)). That definition is as follows:

In determining whether a hired party is an employee under the general common law of agency, we consider the hiring party's right to control the manner and means by which the product is accomplished. Among the other factors relevant to this inquiry are the skill required; the source of the instrumentalities and tools; the location of the work; the duration of the relationship between the parties; whether the hiring party has the right to assign additional projects to the hired party; the extent of the hired party's discretion over when and how long to work; the method of payment; the hired party's role in hiring and paying assistants; whether the work is part of the regular business of the hiring party; whether the hiring party is in business; the provision of employee benefits; and the tax treatment of the hired party.

*Darden*, 503 U.S. at 323-324; see also Restatement (Second) of Agency § 220(2) (1958); *Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates, P.C. v. Wells*, 538 U.S. 440 (2003) (hereinafter “*Clackamas*”). As the common-law test contains “no shorthand formula or magic phrase that can be applied to find the answer, ... all of the incidents of the relationship must be assessed and weighed with no one factor being decisive.” *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324 (quoting *NLRB v. United Ins. Co. of America*, 390 U.S. 254, 258 (1968)).

In considering whether or not one is an “employee,” U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) must focus on the common-law touchstone of control. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. Factors indicating that a worker is an “employee” of an “employer” are clearly delineated in both the *Darden* and *Clackamas* decisions. 503 U.S. at 323-324; see also Restatement (Second) of Agency § 220(2) (1958). Such indicia of control include when, where, and how a worker performs the job; the continuity of the worker's relationship with the employer; the tax treatment of the worker; the provision of employee benefits; and whether the work performed by the worker is part of the employer's regular business. See *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; cf. New Compliance Manual, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, § 2-III(A)(1), (EEOC 2006) (adopting a materially identical test and indicating that said test was based on the *Darden* decision).

It is important to note that the factors listed in *Darden* and *Clackamas* are not exhaustive and must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Other aspects of the relationship between the parties may affect

---

as an “independent contractor” for the petitioner during this time period. A letter signed by the petitioner contained in the record states that the petitioner engaged in contracts with various companies, the work of which would be completed by the petitioner's employees, and that the beneficiary's company would “supply all of the field service employees.”

the determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists. Furthermore, not all or even a majority of the listed criteria need be met; however, the fact finder must weigh and compare a combination of the factors in analyzing the facts of each individual case. The determination must be based on all of the circumstances in the relationship between the parties, regardless of whether the parties refer to it as an employee or as an independent contractor relationship. *See Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; New Compliance Manual at § 2-III(A)(1).

In the present matter, it is unclear that the petitioning entity pays any employee salaries, that it employs anyone directly, or that it would be the beneficiary's actual employer.

In *Clackamas*, the specific inquiry was whether four physicians, actively engaged in medical practice as shareholders, could be considered employees to determine whether the petitioner to qualify as an employer under the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), which necessitates an employer have fifteen employees. The court cites to *Darden* that "We have often been asked to construe the meaning of 'employee' where the statute containing the term does not helpfully define it." *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 444, (citing *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 318, 322). The court found the regulatory definition to be circular in that the ADA defined an "employee" as "individual employed by the employer." *Id.* (citing 42 U.S.C. § 12111(4)). Similarly, in *Darden*, where the court considered whether an insurance salesman was an independent contractor or an "employee" covered by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), the court found the ERISA definition to be circular and adopted a common-law test to determine who would qualify as an "employee under ERISA." *Id.* (citing *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 323). In looking to *Darden*, the court stated, "as *Darden* reminds us, congressional silence often reflects an expectation that courts will look to the common law to fill gaps in statutory text, particularly when an undefined term has a settled meaning in common law. Congress has overridden judicial decisions that went beyond the common law." *Id.* at 447 (citing *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324-325).

The *Clackamas* court considered the common law definition of the master-servant relationship, which focuses on the master's control over the servant. The court cites to definition of "servant" in the Restatement (Second) of Agency § 2(2) (1958): "a servant is a person employed to perform services in the affairs of another and who with respect to the physical conduct in the performance of services is subject to the other's control or right to control."<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 448. The Restatement

---

<sup>11</sup> Section 220, Definition of a Servant, in full states:

- (1) A servant is a person employed to perform services in the affairs of another and who with respect to the physical conduct in the performance of the services is subject to the other's control or right to control.
- (2) In determining whether one acting for another is a servant or an independent contractor, the following matters of fact, among others, are considered:
  - a. The extent of control which, by the agreement, the master may exercise over the details of the work;
  - b. Whether or not the one employed is engaged in a distinct occupation or business;
  - c. The kind of occupation, with reference to whether, in the locality, the work is usually done under the direction of the employer or by a specialist without supervision;

additionally lists factors for consideration when distinguishing between servants and independent contractors, “the first of which is ‘the extent of control’ that one may exercise over the details of the work of the other.” *Id.* (citing § 220(2)(a)). The court also looked to the EEOC’s focus on control<sup>12</sup> in *Skidmore v. Swift & Co.*, 323 U.S. 134, 140 (1944) and that the EEOC considered an employer can hire and fire employees, assign tasks to employees and supervise their performance, can decide how the business’ profits and losses are distributed. *Id.* at 449-450.

From the record, it is unclear that the petitioner will be the beneficiary’s actual employer.

In the present matter, the beneficiary’s non-immigrant record reflects that he is the sole owner of his own company, which contracts his services to the petitioner as an independent contractor. The petitioner pays the beneficiary’s company for services rendered by his company. Therefore, the beneficiary has a direct financial relationship to the petitioner. Under 20 C.F.R. §§ 626.20(c)(8) and 656.3, the petitioner has the burden when asked to show that a valid employment relationship exists, that a *bona fide* job opportunity is available to U.S. workers. *See Matter of Amger Corp.*, 87-INA-545 (BALCA 1987). A relationship invalidating a *bona fide* job offer may arise where the beneficiary is related to the petitioner by “blood” or it may “be financial, by marriage, or through friendship.” *See Matter of Summart 374*, 00-INA-93 (BALCA May 15, 2000). The petitioner would need to demonstrate the job offer is a *bona fide* job opportunity to U.S. workers despite the close financial relationship between the petitioning entity and the beneficiary’s company. Additionally, the petitioner would need to demonstrate that it would employ the beneficiary directly, and not that the petitioner would continue to employ the beneficiary as an independent contractor.<sup>13</sup>

- 
- d. The skill required in the occupation;
  - e. Whether the employer or the workman supplies the instrumentalities, tools, and the place of work for the person doing the work;
  - f. The length of time for which the person is employed;
  - g. The method of payment, whether by the time or by the job;
  - h. Whether or not the work is a part of the regular business of the employer;
  - i. Whether or not the parties believe they are creating the relation of master and servant; and
  - j. Whether the principal is or is not in business.

<sup>12</sup> Additionally, as set forth in the recent Memorandum from Donald Neufeld, Associate Director, Service Center Operations, Determining Employer-Employee Relationship for Adjudication of H-1B Petitions, Including Third Party Site Placements, HQ 70/6.2.8, January 8, 2010, the memo looks to whether the employer has the “right to control” where, when and how the beneficiary performs the job. The memo considers many of the factors set forth in *Darden, Clackamas*, and the Restatement, including who provides the tools necessary to perform the job duties, control to the extent of who hires, pays and fires, if necessary, the beneficiary, and who controls the manner and means by which the beneficiary’s work product is completed.

<sup>13</sup> As the beneficiary is the sole owner of [REDACTED], that company would need to disclose his ownership if it petitioned for the beneficiary. The Form ETA 9089 specifically asks in Section C.9, “ Is the employer a closely held corporation, partnership, or sole proprietorship in which the alien has an ownership interest, or is there a familial relationship between the owners, stockholders,

Further, it is unclear that the petitioner intends to employ the beneficiary in the position offered. A labor certification for a specific job offer is valid only for the particular job opportunity, the alien for whom the certification was granted, and for the area of intended employment stated on the ETA Form 9089. 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(c)(2). According to the ETA Form 9089, the petitioner intends to employ the beneficiary as a project site manager at its headquarters. On the Form I-140, the petitioner indicates that the beneficiary would work as a chairman and managing director at both the petitioner's headquarters and "at client locations." See *Sunoco Energy Development Company*, 17 I&N Dec. 283 (change of area of intended employment). "It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice." *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988). Given the conflicts between the beneficiary's job title as Chairman, and the labor certification job duties as a project site manager,<sup>14</sup> it is not clear that the petitioner intends to employ the beneficiary in the

---

partners, corporate officers, incorporators, and the alien." The regulations were intended so that job offers would be bona fide.

20 C.F.R. § 656.17(1) states in pertinent part:

(l) Alien influence and control over job opportunity. If the employer is a closely held corporation or partnership in which the alien has an ownership interest, or if there is a familial relationship between the stockholders, corporate officers, incorporators, or partners, and the alien, or if the alien is one of a small number of employees, the employer in the event of an audit must be able to demonstrate the existence of a bona fide job opportunity, i.e., the job is available to all U.S. workers, and must provide to the Certifying Officer, the following supporting documentation:

(1) A copy of the articles of incorporation, partnership agreement, business license or similar documents that establish the business entity;

(2) A list of all corporate/company officers and shareholders/partners of the corporation/firm/business, their titles and positions in the business' structure, and a description of the relationships to each other and to the alien beneficiary;

(3) The financial history of the corporation/company/partnership, including the total investment in the business entity and the amount of investment of each officer, incorporator/partner and the alien beneficiary; and

(4) The name of the business' official with primary responsibility for interviewing and hiring applicants for positions within the organization and the name(s) of the business' official(s) having control or influence over hiring decisions involving the position for which labor certification is sought.

(5) If the alien is one of 10 or fewer employees, the employer must document any family relationship between the employees and the alien.

<sup>14</sup> DOL coded the position as a construction manager using code 11-9021. If the beneficiary served as Chairman, this would likely result in the assessment of a different wage. For example, 2006 data shows the wage for a construction manager, Level 4 in the Pittsburgh area as [REDACTED]

certified position. The labor certification is only available for the position offered and cannot be used for another position such as the one specified on the Form I-140.

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.

---

compared to the wage for a Chief Executive Officer, which ranges from \$69,326 (Level 1) to \$164,195 (Level 4).