

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
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

B6




DATE: **DEC 20 2011** Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

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 \$630. 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 preference visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a custom roofing and siding company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a roofer. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner 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 March 31, 2009 denial, the primary issue in this case is whether or not the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence.

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.¹

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.

At the outset, and beyond the decision of the director, it is noted that the petitioner in the instant case is a different entity than the company that filed the Form ETA 750. The labor certification was filed by [REDACTED] a sole proprietorship. The Form I-140 was filed on December 28, 2007, by [REDACTED], a single member limited liability company (LLC). [REDACTED], prior to the priority date. On appeal, counsel asserts that "in 2003, [REDACTED] transferred to a LLC and became [REDACTED]"

If the petitioner is a different entity from the sponsoring employer, then the petitioner must establish that it is a successor-in-interest to that entity.

¹ 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).

USCIS has not issued regulations governing immigrant visa petitions filed by a successor-in-interest employer. Instead, such matters are adjudicated in accordance with *Matter of Dial Auto*, a binding, legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (“INS”) decision that was designated as a precedent by the Commissioner in 1986. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions are binding on all immigration officers in the administration of the Act.

The facts of the precedent decision, *Matter of Dial Auto*, are instructive in this matter. *Matter of Dial Auto* involved a petition filed by Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc. on behalf of an alien beneficiary for the position of automotive technician. The beneficiary’s former employer, Elvira Auto Body, filed the underlying labor certification. On the petition, Dial Auto claimed to be a successor-in-interest to Elvira Auto Body. The part of the Commissioner’s decision relating to the successor-in-interest issue follows:

Additionally, the representations made by the petitioner concerning the relationship between Elvira Auto Body and itself are issues which have not been resolved. In order to determine whether the petitioner was a true successor to Elvira Auto Body, counsel was instructed on appeal to fully explain the manner by which the petitioner took over the business of Elvira Auto Body and to provide the Service with a copy of the contract or agreement between the two entities; however, no response was submitted. If the *petitioner’s claim of having assumed all of Elvira Auto Body’s rights, duties, obligations, etc.*, is found to be untrue, then grounds would exist for invalidation of the labor certification under 20 C.F.R. § 656.30 (1987). Conversely, if the claim is found to be true, and it is determined that an actual successorship exists, the petition could be approved if eligibility is otherwise shown, including ability of the predecessor enterprise to have paid the certified wage at the time of filing.

19 I&N Dec. at 482-83 (emphasis added).

The Commissioner’s decision does not require a successor-in-interest to establish that it assumed all rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, in *Matter of Dial Auto*, the petitioner specifically represented that it had assumed all of the original employer’s rights, duties, and obligations, but failed to submit requested evidence to establish that this claim was, in fact, true. The Commissioner stated that if the petitioner’s claim was untrue, the INS could invalidate the underlying labor certification for fraud or willful misrepresentation. For this reason the Commissioner said: “if the claim is found to be true, *and it is determined that an actual successorship exists, the petition could be approved . . .*” *Id.* (emphasis added).

The Commissioner clearly considered the petitioner’s claim that it had assumed all of the original employer’s rights, duties, and obligations to be a separate inquiry from whether or not the petitioner is a successor-in-interest. The Commissioner was most interested in receiving a full explanation as to the “manner by which the petitioner took over the business” and seeing a copy of “the contract or agreement between the two entities” in order to verify the petitioner’s claims. *Id.* at 482.

Accordingly, *Matter of Dial Auto* does not stand for the proposition that a valid successor relationship may only be established through the assumption of “all” or a totality of a predecessor entity’s rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, the generally accepted definition of a successor-in-interest is broader: “[O]ne who follows another in ownership or control of property. A successor in interest retains the same rights as the original owner, with no change in substance.” *Black’s Law Dictionary* 1570 (defining “successor in interest”). A petitioner is not precluded from demonstrating a successor-in-interest relationship simply because it acquired a division of the predecessor entity instead of purchasing the predecessor in its entirety.

With respect to corporations, a successor is generally created when one corporation is vested with the rights and obligations of an earlier corporation through amalgamation, consolidation, or other assumption of interests.² *Id.* at 1569 (defining “successor”). When considering other business organizations, such as partnerships or sole proprietorships, even a partial change in ownership may require the petitioner to establish that it is a true successor-in-interest to the employer identified in the labor certification application. *See eg. Matter of United Investment Group*, 19 I&N Dec. 248 (Comm’r 1984).

The merger or consolidation of a business organization into another will give rise to a successor-in-interest relationship because the assets and obligations are transferred by operation of law. However, a mere transfer of assets or asset transaction, even one that takes up a predecessor’s business activities, does not necessarily create a successor-in-interest. *See Holland v. Williams Mountain Coal Co.*, 496 F.3d 670, 672 (D.C. Cir. 2007). An asset transaction occurs when one business organization sells property – such as real estate, machinery, or intellectual property - to another business organization. The purchase of assets from a predecessor will only result in a successor-in-interest relationship if the parties agree to the transfer and assumption of the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business.³ *See generally* 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2170 (2010).

² Merger and acquisition transactions, in which the interests of two or more corporations become unified, may be arranged into four general groups. The first group includes “consolidations” that occur when two or more corporations are united to create one new corporation. The second group includes “mergers,” consisting of a transaction in which one of the constituent companies remains in being, absorbing the other constituent corporation. The third type of combination includes “reorganizations” that occur when the new corporation is the reincarnation or reorganization of one previously existing. The fourth group includes transactions in which a corporation, although continuing to exist as a “shell” legal entity, is in fact merged into another through the acquisition of its assets and business operations. 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2165 (2010).

³ The mere assumption of immigration obligations, or the transfer of immigration benefits derived from approved or pending immigration petitions or applications, will not give rise to a successor-in-interest relationship unless the transfer results from the bona fide acquisition of the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business. *See* 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2170; *see also* 20 C.F.R. § 656.12(a).

Considering *Matter of Dial Auto* and the generally accepted definition of successor-in-interest, a petitioner may establish a valid successor relationship for immigration purposes if it satisfies three conditions. First, the petitioning successor must fully describe and document the transaction transferring ownership of all, or the relevant parts of, the beneficiary's predecessor employer. Second, the petitioning successor must demonstrate that the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification. Third, the petitioning successor must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it can establish eligibility for the immigrant visa in all respects.

Evidence of transfer of ownership must show that the successor not only purchased assets from the predecessor, but also acquired the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business. To ensure that the job opportunity remains the same as originally certified, the successor must continue to operate the same type of business as the predecessor, in the same metropolitan statistical area, and the successor's essential business functions must remain substantially the same as before the ownership transfer. See *Matter of Dial Auto*, 19 I&N Dec. at 482.

In order to establish eligibility for the immigrant visa in all respects, the petitioner must support its claim with all necessary evidence, including evidence of ability to pay. The petitioning successor must prove the predecessor's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and until the date of transfer of ownership to the successor. In addition, the petitioner must establish the successor's ability to pay the proffered wage in accordance from the date of transfer of ownership forward. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2); see also *Matter of Dial Auto*, 19 I&N Dec. at 482.

Applying the analysis set forth above to the instant petition, the petitioner has not established a valid successor relationship for immigration purposes.

The petitioner did not describe and document its acquisition of the alleged predecessor. Instead, counsel merely claims on appeal that "in 2003, [redacted] transferred to a LLC and became [redacted] was formed [redacted], and there is no evidence of a claimed 2003 "transfer" in the record. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaignena*, 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). Therefore, the petition must be denied because the petitioner failed to establish that it is a successor-in-interest to the entity that filed the underlying labor certification with the DOL.

Nonetheless, even if the petitioner did establish that was a successor-in-interest to [redacted] it has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage.

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 ETA Form 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).

The Form ETA 750 in this case was accepted for processing by the DOL on May 2, 2003. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$15.00 per hour, (\$31,200 per year). The Form ETA 750 indicates that the offered position requires six years of grade school education and two years of experience in the job offered of roofer.

The petitioner is a single-member limited liability company (LLC).⁴ On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established on [REDACTED] to have a gross annual income of \$600,000, and to currently employ 2 workers. According to the Form ETA 750, the beneficiary claimed to have worked as a roofer (helper) for [REDACTED] from October 1996 through May 2001, and as a roofer for the petitioner from June 2001 through to the date he signed the Form ETA 750 on April 7, 2003.

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

⁴ A limited liability company is an entity formed under state law by filing articles of organization. A limited liability company may be classified for federal income tax purposes as if it were a sole proprietorship, a partnership or a corporation. If the LLC has only one owner, it will automatically be treated as a sole proprietorship unless an election is made to be treated as a corporation. If the LLC has two or more owners, it will automatically be considered to be a partnership unless an election is made to be treated as a corporation. If the LLC does not elect its classification, a default classification of partnership (multi-member LLC) or disregarded entity (taxed as if it were a sole proprietorship) will apply. *See* 26 C.F.R. § 301.7701-3. The election referred to is made using IRS Form 8832, Entity Classification Election. In the instant case, the petitioner, a single-member LLC, is considered to be a sole proprietorship for federal tax purposes.

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 a Request for Evidence (RFE) dated May 3, 2011, the AAO requested the petitioner to submit evidence of the date that [REDACTED] such as copies of its Articles of Organization; complete federal tax returns for 2003 through 2009, with all schedules and attachments;⁵ Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Forms 1099, Miscellaneous Income, or IRS Forms W-2, Wage and Tax Statements, issued to the beneficiary from 2003 to the present as evidence of wages paid; and a letter from the beneficiary's prior employer(s) that comply with 8 C.F.R. 204.5(1)(3)(ii)(B).⁶

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 this case, the petitioner has submitted IRS Forms 1099, Miscellaneous Income, indicating that it paid the beneficiary \$77,125 in 2003; \$89,005 and \$25,000 in 2004; \$86,075 and \$50,000 in 2005; \$80,025 in 2006; \$64,855 in 2007; and, \$2,000 in 2008. Therefore, the petitioner has established that it paid the beneficiary at or above the proffered wage in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007.⁷ The petitioner has also established that it paid the

⁵ The petitioner did not submit complete copies of its tax returns either on appeal or in response to the AAO's RFE. Instead, it only submitted copies of Schedule C for each year. 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). In order to satisfy the requirement, complete tax returns must be submitted, not just a selected portion. The petitioner's failure to provide this evidence 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)).

⁶ The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3)(ii)(B) provides that a petition for an alien in this classification must be accompanied by evidence that the beneficiary "meets the education, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification."

⁷ However, it is noted that there is no evidence in the record that the Forms 1099 issued to the beneficiary for 2003 through 2008 were solely for the beneficiary's labor. These amounts may have included reimbursement for materials and/or other workers assisting the beneficiary with his subcontracted labor.

beneficiary partial wages in 2008. The petitioner did not pay the beneficiary in 2009 and 2010.⁸ Thus, the petitioner must establish that it can pay the beneficiary the difference between the wages paid and the proffered wage in 2008, which is \$29,200, as well as the full proffered wage in 2009 and 2010.

If, as in this case, 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 (1st Cir. 2009); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010). 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).

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. See also *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010).

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.

⁸ The petitioner claims that "upon advice of his accountant, [REDACTED] has not utilized the services of [the beneficiary] since the beginning of 2008. They will hire him upon the receipt of his alien registration card."

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 118. “[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).

As is noted above, the petitioner did not provide its full tax returns as required by regulation. However, even considering the submitted Schedules C, the petitioner’s net income for 2008 was \$28,205. Therefore, the petitioner has not established that it had sufficient net income in 2008 to pay the beneficiary the difference between the wages paid and the proffered wage in that year. In addition, in response to the AAO’s RFE, the petitioner submitted Schedules C for 2009 and 2010. The net profit, as shown on the Schedule C’s, was \$53,595 for 2009 and for 2010, it was -\$7,117. Therefore, the petitioner had sufficient funds to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage of \$31,200 in 2009, but not in 2010. Hence, the petitioner has not established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage of \$31,200 in the years 2008 and 2010.

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 Sonegawa*, 12 I&N 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 this case, the petitioner has not established its historical growth, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, or its reputation within its industry. The petitioner did not establish that its longevity, the magnitude of its operations or the size of its payroll were so

substantial as to overcome its shortfall in net income and net current assets. Therefore, the AAO concludes that the petitioner has not demonstrated adequate financial strength to demonstrate its continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition.

Furthermore, beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary has the education and experience required of the job offered. 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).

To determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for an employment based immigrant visa, USCIS must examine whether the alien's credentials meet the requirements set forth in the labor certification. 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. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981). According to the plain terms of the labor certification, the applicant must have six years of grade school education and two years of experience in the job offered.

The petitioner must demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its labor certification application, 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). As previously stated, the labor certification application was accepted on May 2, 2003.

In this case, the record contains no evidence that the beneficiary has six years of grade school education.

In addition, a beneficiary is required to document prior experience in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(i)(3), which provides that:

(ii) *Other documentation—*

(A) *General.* Any requirements of training or experience for skilled workers, professionals, or other workers must be supported by letters from trainers or employers giving the name, address, and title of the trainer or employer, and a description of the training received or the experience of the alien.

(B) *Skilled workers.* If the petition is for a skilled worker, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or

experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification, meets the requirements for Schedule A designation, or meets the requirements for the Labor Market Information Pilot Program occupation designation. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

On the Form ETA 750, the beneficiary indicated that he had been employed as a roofer (helper) for [REDACTED] from October 1996 through May 2001, and as a roofer for the petitioner from June 2001 through to the date he signed the Form ETA 750 on April 7, 2003. With regard to the beneficiary's experience, the record contains a letter dated March 24, 2008 from the petitioner stating that the beneficiary had been subcontracting for the company since June 2001, and a "Proposal" letter dated May 7, 2003 from [REDACTED] stating that the beneficiary worked for the company on and off for about two in [sic] a half years doing roofing."⁹

Neither of the letters submitted demonstrate that the beneficiary has two years of full-time experience in the position offered as of the priority date. The letters are not executed by prior employers, they do not provide the exact dates of employment or provide a detailed description of the duties performed, and they do not provide the hours per week worked by the beneficiary. Therefore, they are insufficient to demonstrate that the beneficiary has two years of full-time experience in the position offered, and the petitioner has failed to adequately document that the beneficiary has the required experience to meet the terms of the certified labor certification.

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.

⁹ The beneficiary's experience with [REDACTED] was not listed on the Form ETA 750B. In *Matter of Leung*, 16 I&N Dec. 2530 (BIA 1976), the Board's dicta notes that the beneficiary's experience, without such fact certified by DOL on the beneficiary's Form ETA 750B, lessens the credibility of the evidence and facts asserted. The record does not contain any independent corroborating evidence of the claimed experience other than the letter.