

**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: **SEP 27 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:

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 Director, Texas Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed. The AAO will return the matter to the director for consideration as a motion to reopen and reconsider.

In order to properly file an appeal, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that the affected party or the attorney or representative of record must file the complete appeal within 30 days of service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The date of filing is not the date of mailing, but the date of actual receipt. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record indicates that the service center director issued the decision on June 3, 2008. It is noted that the service center director properly gave notice to the petitioner that it had 33 days to file the appeal. Neither the Immigration and Nationality Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend this time limit.

The appeal was received by the director of the service center on August 22, 2008 with the proper fee, or 80 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed. It is noted that the service center received the Form I-290B on July 7, 2008 with the wrong filing fee. However, appeals accompanied by an incorrect or missing filing fee do not retain receipt dates. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2) states that, if an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the Director of the Texas Service Center. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii).

The matter will therefore be returned to the director. If the director determines that the late appeal meets the requirements of a motion, the motion shall be granted and a new decision will be issued.

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

Even were the AAO was to adjudicate the appeal on the merits, the appeal would be dismissed.¹

¹ The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a Chinese specialty cook. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien 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. Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on November 12, 2002. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$10.75 per hour at 40 hours per week (\$22,360.00 per year).

While the appeal is untimely filed and must be rejected, even were the AAO to consider the petitioner's claim that she has the ability to pay the proffered wage, the petitioner has not established the ability to pay the proffered wage, and the appeal would nonetheless be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of a Form ETA 750 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, 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). The petitioner has not submitted any evidence that it employed the beneficiary or paid him wages during the relevant period.

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 petitioner's 2006 federal income tax return was the most recent tax return before the director for review. The petitioner's net income for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 was not sufficient to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner's net current asset amounts for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 were insufficient to pay the proffered wage. Therefore, from the date the Form ETA 750 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.