


**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

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**

PUBLIC COPY



B6

Date:

NOV 28 2011

Office: NEBRASKA 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:

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 \$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 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 elderly care facility. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cook. 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 August 28, 2008 denial, the 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. On appeal, we have identified a second issue of whether the petitioner submitted sufficient regulatory proscribed evidence to establish that the beneficiary has the experience required by the terms of the labor certification.

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.

On the Form I-290B, counsel indicated that he would submit a brief or other evidence within 30 days of filing the appeal. That Form was submitted on September 30, 2008. To date, the AAO has not received anything from counsel concerning this appeal. Therefore, the decision will be issued on the record as it presently stands.

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

Here, the ETA Form 9089 was accepted on April 30, 2001.¹ The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$13.95 per hour (\$29,016 per year). The ETA Form 9089 states that the position requires 24 months of experience as a cook in an elderly care facility.

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.²

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a C corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1995, to have a gross annual income of \$704,638, and to currently employ 12 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is the same as the calendar year. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary, the beneficiary claimed to have begun working for the petitioner in April 1995.

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

¹ 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. New United States Department of Labor (DOL) regulations concerning labor certifications went into effect on March 28, 2005. The new regulations are referred to by 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. In this case, the PERM regulations apply because the petitioner filed a labor certification application on ETA Form 9089 seeking to convert the previously submitted ETA Form 750 to an ETA 9089 under the special conversion guidelines set forth in PERM. 20 C.F.R. § 656.17(d) sets forth the requirements necessary for the converted labor certification application to retain the priority date set forth on the former ETA 750.

² 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).

evaluating whether a job offer is realistic. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 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'l Comm'r 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 petitioner submitted the following evidence of wages paid to the beneficiary:

- The 2005 Form W-2 stated that the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$3,192.00.
- The 2006 Form W-2 stated that the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$21,360.00.
- The 2007 Form W-2 stated that the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$27,120.00.
- Paystubs indicate that the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$7,280.00 from January 1 to June 16, 2008.

As the amounts paid by the petitioner to the beneficiary are less than the proffered wage, the petitioner must establish its ability to pay the difference between the actual wage paid and the proffered wage, which in 2005 was \$25,824; in 2006 was \$7,656; in 2007 was \$1,896; and in 2008 was \$21,736. The petitioner must establish its ability to pay the full proffered wage in 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004.³

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 (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). Reliance on the petitioner's gross sales and profits and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross sales and profits exceeded the proffered wage is

³ The beneficiary states on ETA Form 9089 that she has been employed with the petitioner since April 1995, however, the petitioner did not submit any evidence of pay for the beneficiary prior to 2005.

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 the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. See *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d at 881 (gross profits overstate an employer's ability to pay because it ignores other necessary expenses).

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 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).

For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The record before the director closed on August 11, 2008 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 2008 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2007 would be the most recent return available.⁴ The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2001 through 2005, as shown in the table below.

⁴ The petitioner did not submit either its 2006 or 2007 tax returns in response to the director's RFE or on appeal despite the director's specific request for these in his Request for Evidence. The failure

- In 2001, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$6,582.
- In 2002, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$462.
- In 2003, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$2,767.
- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$2,223.
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$122.

In addition, the petitioner has filed other Immigrant Petitions for Alien Workers (Form I-140) for four more beneficiaries, two with a 2001 priority date, one with a 2004 priority date, and one with a 2010 priority date. Therefore, 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 petitions, as of the priority date of each petition and continuing until the beneficiary of each petition obtains lawful permanent residence. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 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). As the petitioner's net income in 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 was less than the proffered wage to the instant beneficiary and the petitioner's 2005 net income is insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the difference between the actual wages paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage, it is unnecessary to consider the proffered wages for the other beneficiaries.

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 net current assets. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.⁵ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6 and include cash-on-hand. 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 tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets for 2001 through 2005, as shown in the table below.

- In 2001, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$32,713.
- In 2002, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$26,975.
- In 2003, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$3,573.

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). The director also noted this deficiency in his decision, however, the petitioner failed to submit such documentation on appeal.

⁵According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3rd ed. 2000), "current assets" consist of items having (in most cases) a life of one year or less, such as cash, marketable securities, inventory and prepaid expenses. "Current liabilities" are obligations payable (in most cases) within one year, such accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$8,371.
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$3,336.

Although the petitioner's net current assets in 2001 would be sufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage to the instant beneficiary, without evidence of the proffered wage owed or any wages paid to the other sponsored workers, the petitioner has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage to this beneficiary in 2001. The petitioner's net current assets in 2002, 2003, and 2004 are insufficient to establish the ability to pay the proffered wage to the instant beneficiary or any of the other sponsored workers. The petitioner's 2005 net current assets are less than the difference between the actual wages paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage, and therefore would be insufficient to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage to the instant beneficiary or any of the other sponsored workers. As noted above, the petitioner failed to submit its 2006 or 2007 federal tax returns, annual reports, or audited financial statements as required by the director in his RFE. The director also noted the deficiency in his decision.

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.

In response to the director's RFE, the petitioner submitted a letter from its president stating that it has "been in business for over 14 years and has shown a continual growth and profit throughout each of these 14 years." In support of its president's letter, the petitioner submitted a chart of "annual gross revenue" for 1994 through 2007.⁶ The tax returns in the record show increasing gross receipts for 2001 to 2005, however, the petitioner's net income has not increased over the years, but instead, the tax returns demonstrate that the petitioner's highest net income was in 2001 and declined thereafter. The letter also states that the petitioner has "access to liquid assets in excess of \$200,000 and credit in excess of \$50,000." The petitioner's cash assets have already been considered in the net current assets above. Additionally, the petitioner's tax returns reflect much lower numbers for cash. The petitioner did not submit any other evidence related to "liquid assets" or its credit.⁷ As a

⁶ The figures for gross income in some years on that chart differ from the figures for gross income on the petitioner's tax returns for 2001, 2002, 2004, and 2005. "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).

⁷ In calculating the ability to pay the proffered salary, USCIS will not augment the petitioner's net income or net current assets by adding in the petitioner's credit limits, bank lines, or lines of credit. A "bank line" or "line of credit" is a bank's unenforceable commitment to make loans to a particular borrower up to a specified maximum during a specified time period. A line of credit is not a contractual or legal obligation on the part of the bank. See John Downes and Jordan Elliot Goodman, *Barron's Dictionary of Finance and Investment Terms* 45 (5th ed. 1998).

result, it is unclear where the figures in the chart and the assertions in the letter originate. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). The letter also states that the petitioner "has an exceptional reputation," however, the petitioner presented no evidence to support this assertion. 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'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg'l Comm'r 1972)).

USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's business activities in its determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. See *Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg'l Comm'r 1967). The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about \$100,000. During the year in which the petition was filed in that case, the petitioner changed business locations and paid rent on both the old and new locations for five months. There were large moving costs and also a period of time when the petitioner was unable to do regular business. The Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner's prospects for a resumption of successful business operations were well established. The petitioner was a fashion designer whose work had been featured in *Time* and *Look* magazines. Her clients included Miss Universe, movie actresses, and society matrons. The petitioner's clients had been included in the lists of the best-dressed California women. The petitioner lectured on fashion design at design and fashion shows throughout the United States and at colleges and universities in California. The Regional Commissioner's determination in *Sonogawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonogawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of a petitioner's net income and net current assets. USCIS may consider such factors as the

Moreover, the petitioner's existent loans will be reflected in the balance sheet provided in the tax return or audited financial statement and will be fully considered in the evaluation of the petitioner's net current assets. Comparable to the limit on a credit card, the line of credit cannot be treated as cash or as a cash asset. However, if the petitioner wishes to rely on a line of credit as evidence of ability to pay, the petitioner must submit documentary evidence, such as a detailed business plan and audited cash flow statements, to demonstrate that the line of credit will augment and not weaken its overall financial position. Finally, USCIS will give less weight to loans and debt as a means of paying salary since the debts will increase the petitioner's liabilities and will not improve its overall financial position. Although lines of credit and debt are an integral part of any business operation, USCIS must evaluate the overall financial position of a petitioner to determine whether the employer is making a realistic job offer and has the overall financial ability to satisfy the proffered wage. See *Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977). Nothing in the record shows that the petitioner has any line of credit or that it was available at the time of the priority date. Additionally, as noted above, the petitioner must demonstrate that it can pay all of its sponsored workers. The evidence in the record does not demonstrate that the petitioner can pay the proffered wage to this single beneficiary or the respective proffered wages to the additional sponsored workers.

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 evidence in the record indicates that the petitioner had minimal net income in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 and minimal net current assets in 2003, 2004, and 2005. The petitioner also sponsored four additional workers. Therefore, its total wage obligation is unclear. The petitioner failed to submit its tax returns for 2006 or 2007 as requested by the director who also noted the deficiency in his decision. As stated above, the petitioner submitted no evidence of its reputation or that it experienced one off year to liken its circumstances to the ones presented in *Sonegawa*. 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.

In addition to the failure to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage, the petitioner failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the beneficiary had the experience required by the terms of the labor certification. 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). 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 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3) provides:

(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 ETA Form 9089, the beneficiary listed her prior work experience as a cook with the petitioner beginning on April 15, 1995 and as a cook with [REDACTED] from January 1997 to December 1990.

The letter in the record to confirm the beneficiary's experience is titled "Work Certificate" and was purportedly issued by [REDACTED]. The letter states that the beneficiary was employed from January 12, 1987 to December 31, 1990. The letter does not indicate, however, whether the beneficiary was employed in a full-time or part-time capacity to demonstrate that she had the full two years of experience required by the terms of the labor certification.

In addition, the translation of the letter submitted to demonstrate the beneficiary's experience did not comply with the terms of 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3):

Translations. Any document containing foreign language submitted to [USCIS] shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English.

The translation of the letter is not accompanied by a certified translation in compliance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3). As a result, based on the foregoing, the petitioner failed to submit sufficient regulatory proscribed evidence to establish that the beneficiary had the full two years of experience required by the terms of the labor certification.

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. 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.