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

[redacted]

DATE: DEC 0 3 2012 OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER FILE: [redacted]

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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of $630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

for

Ron Rosenberg
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: On June 8, 2002, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), Vermont Service Center (VSC), received an Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, Form I-140, from the petitioner. The employment-based immigrant visa petition was initially approved by the VSC director on May 15, 2003. The director of the Texas Service Center (the director), however, revoked the approval of the immigrant petition on June 28, 2010 with a finding of fraud, and the petitioner subsequently appealed the director's decision to revoke the petition's approval to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The director's decision will be withdrawn. The petition will be remanded.

Section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1155, provides that "[t]he Attorney General [now Secretary, Department of Homeland Security], may, at any time, for what [she] deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by [her] under section 204." The realization by the director that the petition was approved in error may be good and sufficient cause for revoking the approval. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 590 (BIA 1988).

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cook pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §1153(b)(3)(A)(i).[1] As required by statute, the petition is submitted along with an approved Form ETA 750 labor certification. As stated earlier, this petition was approved on May 15, 2003 by the VSC, but that approval was revoked in June 2010. The director determined that the petitioner failed to follow the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) recruitment procedures in connection with the approved labor certification application. The director also noted inconsistencies in the evidence submitted concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Accordingly, the director revoked the approval of the petition under the authority of 8 C.F.R. § 205.2.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner[2] contends that the director has improperly revoked the approval of the petition. Specifically, counsel asserts that the director did not have any good and sufficient cause as required by section 205 of the Act; 8 U.S.C. § 1155 to revoke the approval of the petition. Counsel argues that the petitioner did comply with the DOL recruitment requirements and that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onwards.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d

---

[1] Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of 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.

[2] Current counsel of record, [redacted] will be referred to as counsel throughout this decision. Previous counsel, [redacted] will be referred to by name. The AAO notes that [redacted] was suspended from the practice of law before the Immigration Courts, Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA), and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) for a period of three years from March 1, 2012 to February 28, 2015.

143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.[3]

The threshold issue on appeal is whether the director adequately advised the petitioner of the basis for revocation of approval of the petition. As noted above, the Secretary of DHS has the authority to revoke the approval of any petition approved by her under section 204 for good and sufficient cause. *See* section 205 of the Act; 8 U.S.C. § 1155. This means that notice must be provided to the petitioner before a previously approved petition can be revoked. More specifically, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 205.2 reads:

> (a) *General.* Any [USCIS] officer authorized to approve a petition under section 204 of the Act may revoke the approval of that petition **upon notice to the petitioner** on any ground other than those specified in § 205.1 when the necessity for the revocation comes to the attention of this [USCIS]. (emphasis added).

Further, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16) states:

> (i) Derogatory information unknown to petitioner or applicant. If the decision will be adverse to the applicant or petitioner and is based on derogatory information considered by [USCIS] and of which the applicant or petitioner is unaware, he/she shall be advised of this fact and offered an opportunity to rebut the information and present information in his/her own behalf before the decision is rendered, except as provided in paragraphs (b)(16)(ii), (iii), and (iv) of this section. Any explanation, rebuttal, or information presented by or in behalf of the applicant or petitioner shall be included in the record of proceeding.

Moreover, *Matter of Arias*, 19 I&N Dec. 568 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Estime*, 19 I&N Dec. 450 (BIA 1987) provide that:

> A notice of intention to revoke the approval of a visa petition is properly issued for "good and sufficient cause" when the evidence of record at the time of issuance, if unexplained and unrebutted, would warrant a denial of the visa petition based upon the petitioner's failure to meet his burden of proof. However, where a notice of intention to revoke is based upon an unsupported statement, revocation of the visa petition cannot be sustained.

Here, in the NOIR dated February 17, 2009, the director wrote:

---

[3] The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

> The Service is in receipt of information revealing the existence of fraudulent information in the petitions with Alien Employment Certificates (ETA 750) and/or the work experience letters in a significant number of cases submitted to USCIS by counsel for the petitioner in the reviewed files.

The director advised the petitioner in the NOIR that the instant case might involve fraud. The director specifically asked the petitioner to submit additional evidence to demonstrate that it had complied with all of the DOL recruiting requirements. The director also asked the petitioner to submit an original letter reaffirming its intent to employ the beneficiary in the proffered job and evidence that the beneficiary met the minimum experience requirements.

The AAO finds that while the director appropriately reopened the approval of the petition by issuing the NOIR, the director's NOIR was deficient in that it did not specifically give the petitioner notice of the derogatory information specific to the current proceeding. In the NOIR, the director questioned the beneficiary's qualifications and indicated that the petitioner had not properly advertised for the position. The NOIR neither provided nor referred to specific evidence or information relating to the petitioner's failure to comply with DOL recruitment or to the beneficiary's lack of qualifications in the present case. The director did not state which recruitment procedures were defective. Without specifying or making available evidence specific to the petition in this case, the petitioner can have no meaningful opportunity to rebut or respond to that evidence. *See Ghaly v. INS*, 48 F.3d 1426, 1431 (7th Cir. 1995). Because of insufficient notice to the petitioner of derogatory information, the director's decision will be withdrawn.

Another issue raised on appeal is whether the director properly concluded that the petitioner did not comply with the recruitment procedures of the DOL. The director indicated that the petitioner did not conduct good faith recruitment and found that the petitioner had engaged in fraud or material misrepresentation with respect to the recruitment process. The AAO disagrees. The record does not show inconsistencies or anomalies in the recruitment process that would justify the issuance of a NOIR based on the criteria of *Matter of S & B-C-*, 9 I&N Dec. 436, 447 (A.G. 1961). Therefore, the director's conclusion that the petitioner did not comply with DOL requirements is withdrawn.

The AAO will next address the director's finding that the petitioner engaged in fraud and/or material misrepresentation. On appeal, counsel contends that the director's finding of fraud or willful misrepresentation against the petitioner was arbitrary and based on a USCIS investigation of other petitioners that had been represented by the same counsel,

With regard to immigration fraud, the Act provides immigration officers with the authority to administer oaths, consider evidence, and further provides that any person who knowingly or willfully gives false evidence or swears to any false statement shall be guilty of perjury. Section 287(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1357(b). Additionally, the Secretary of DHS has delegated to USCIS the authority to investigate alleged civil and criminal violations of the immigration laws, including application fraud, make recommendations for prosecution, and take other "appropriate action." DHS Delegation Number 0150.1 at para. (2)(I).

The administrative findings in an immigration proceeding must include specific findings of fraud or material misrepresentation for any issue of fact that is material to eligibility for the requested immigration benefit. Within the adjudication of the visa petition, a finding of fraud or material misrepresentation will undermine the probative value of the evidence and lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. at 591-592.

Outside of the basic adjudication of visa eligibility, there are many critical functions of DHS that hinge on a finding of fraud or material misrepresentation. For example, the Act provides that an alien is inadmissible to the United States if that alien seeks to procure, has sought to procure, or has procured a visa, admission, or other immigration benefits by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact. Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182. Additionally, the regulations state that the willful failure to provide full and truthful information requested by USCIS constitutes a failure to maintain nonimmigrant status. 8 C.F.R. § 214.1(f). For these provisions to be effective, USCIS is required to enter a factual finding of fraud or material misrepresentation into the administrative record.[4]

Section 204(b) of the Act states, in pertinent part, that:

> After an investigation of the facts in each case . . . the [Secretary of Homeland Security] shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien . . . in behalf of whom the petition is made is an immediate relative specified in section 201(b) or is eligible for preference under subsection (a) or (b) of section 203, approve the petition . . . .

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the Act, USCIS has the authority to issue a determination regarding whether the facts stated in a petition filed pursuant to section 203(b) of the Act are true. Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act governs misrepresentation and states the following: "Misrepresentation. – (i) In general. – Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible."

The Attorney General has held that a misrepresentation made in connection with an application for a visa or other document, or with entry into the United States, is material if either:

---

[4] It is important to note that, while it may present the opportunity to enter an administrative finding of fraud, the immigrant visa petition is not the appropriate forum for finding an alien inadmissible. *See Matter of O*, 8 I&N Dec. 295 (BIA 1959). Instead, the alien may be found inadmissible at a later date when he or she subsequently applies for admission into the United States or applies for adjustment of status to permanent resident status. *See* sections 212(a) and 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a) and 1255(a). Nevertheless, the AAO and USCIS have the authority to enter a fraud finding, if during the course of adjudication, the record of proceedings discloses fraud or a material misrepresentation.

> (1) the alien is excludable on the true facts, or (2) the misrepresentation tends to shut off a line of inquiry which is relevant to the alien's eligibility and which might well have resulted in a proper determination that he be excluded.

Matter of S & B-C-, 9 I&N Dec. at 447. Accordingly, the materiality test has three parts. First, if the record shows that the alien is inadmissible on the true facts, then the misrepresentation is material. *Id.* at 448. If the foreign national would not be inadmissible on the true facts, then the second and third questions must be addressed. The second question is whether the misrepresentation shut off a line of inquiry relevant to the alien's admissibility. *Id.* Third, if the relevant line of inquiry has been cut off, then it must be determined whether the inquiry might have resulted in a proper determination that the foreign national should have been excluded. *Id.* at 449.

Furthermore, a finding of misrepresentation may lead to invalidation of the Form ETA 750. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 656.31(d) regarding labor certification applications involving fraud or willful misrepresentation:

> Finding of fraud or willful misrepresentation. If as referenced in Sec. 656.30(d), a court, the DHS or the Department of State determines there was fraud or willful misrepresentation involving a labor certification application, the application will be considered to be invalidated, processing is terminated, a notice of the termination and the reason therefore is sent by the Certifying Officer to the employer, attorney/agent as appropriate.

Here, as noted above, the evidence of record currently does not support the director's finding that the petitioner failed to follow recruitment procedures. Similarly, there has been an insufficient development of the facts upon which the director can make a determination of fraud or willful misrepresentation in connection with the labor certification process based on the criteria of *Matter of S & B-C-*, 9 I&N Dec. at 447. Thus, the director's finding of fraud or misrepresentation is withdrawn. In summary, the AAO withdraws the director's conclusion that the petitioner failed to follow DOL recruitment requirements. The AAO also withdraws the petitioner's finding of fraud and material misrepresentation against the petitioner.

Nonetheless, the petitioner must establish its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onwards. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), in pertinent part, provides:

> *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.

In the instant case, the ETA 750 labor certification was accepted for processing on April 30, 2001. The rate of pay or the proffered wage specified on the ETA 750 is $12.57 per hour or $22,877.40 per year based on the indicated 35 hour work week.[5] The record contains Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Forms W-2 evidencing that the petitioner paid the beneficiary $23,320 in 2004, $22,880 in 2005, $7,040 in 2006, $5,905 in 2008, and $25,960 in 2009.[6] Thus, the petitioner has established the ability to pay the proffered wage in 2004, 2005, and 2009.

The petitioner submitted a series of checks from the petitioner to the beneficiary. In 2003, these amounted to $4,594 and in 2008 these totaled $5,040. Thus, the petitioner has failed to establish the ability to pay in 2003 or 2008.[7]

The petitioner submitted its Form 1120S for 2001 showing a net income of $20,415[8] and net current assets of $7,672.[9] These amounts are less than the proffered wage so are insufficient to demonstrate

---

[5] The total hours per week indicated on the approved Form ETA 750 is 35 hours. This is permitted so long as the job opportunity is for a permanent and full-time position. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 656.3; 656.10(c)(10). The DOL Memo indicates that full-time means at least 35 hours or more per week. *See* Memo, Farmer, Admin. for Reg'l. Mngm't., Div. of Foreign Labor Certification, DOL Field Memo No. 48-94 (May 16, 1994).

[6] The petitioner provided both a Form W-2 and a Form 1099 demonstrating payments made to the beneficiary in 2009.

[7] As the director noted, the check stubs were dated sequentially even though they were dated weeks apart and the petitioner has more than one employee. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Id.* On appeal, counsel stated that the petitioner's owner often did not write pay checks in a timely fashion so that three weeks or a month's worth of checks might be written at the same time and thus bear sequential numbers. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

[8] 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. If the Schedule K has relevant entries for additional income, credits, deductions or other adjustments, net income is found on line 23 of Schedule K. *See* Instructions for Form 1120S, at http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf (accessed November 15, 2012) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholders' shares of the corporation's income, deductions, credits, etc.). Because the petitioner had additional adjustments shown on its Schedule K, the petitioner's net income is found on Schedule K of its tax return for 2001.

[9] 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. A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18.

the petitioner's ability to pay in that year. The petitioner also submitted a copy of the first page of its bank statements covering the period of June 1, 2001 through December 31, 2001. Reliance on the balance in the petitioner's bank account is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), required to illustrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. While this regulation allows additional material "in appropriate cases," the petitioner in this case has not demonstrated why the documentation specified at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) is inapplicable or otherwise paints an inaccurate financial picture of the petitioner. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. Third, no evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the funds reported on the petitioner's bank statements somehow reflect additional available funds that were not reflected on its tax return(s), such as the petitioner's taxable income (income minus deductions) or the cash specified on Schedule L that was considered in determining the petitioner's net current assets. The evidence in the record does not establish that the petitioner employed the beneficiary or that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage from 2001 onwards other than in 2004, 2005, and 2009.

In view of the foregoing, the previous decision of the director will be withdrawn. The petition is remanded to the director for review and consideration of the additional issues that impact the petitioner's eligibility for the visa that were not initially identified by the director. The director may issue a new notice of intent to revoke approval of the petition and may request any additional evidence considered pertinent. Similarly, the petitioner may provide additional evidence within a reasonable period of time to be determined by the director. Upon receipt of all the evidence, the director may review the entire record and enter a new decision. If the new decision is contrary to the AAO's findings, it should be certified to the AAO for review.

ORDER: The director's decision to revoke the previously approved petition is withdrawn. The petition is remanded to the director for further action in accordance with the foregoing and entry of a new decision.

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.