

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: **FEB 15 2012**

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

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a 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.

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 September 11, 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 an additional ground of ineligibility in that the petitioner did not submit sufficient evidence to establish that the beneficiary had 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.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>1</sup>

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states in pertinent part:

*Ability of prospective employer to pay wage.* Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

---

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

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, Application for Alien 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 Form ETA 750, Application for Alien 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 Form ETA 750 was accepted on April 30, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$13.80 per hour (\$25,116 per year based on the indicated 35 hour per week schedule). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience as a cook / international.

The evidence in the record of proceeding does not state the date that the petitioner was established. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to currently employ 16 workers. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on November 26, 2001, the beneficiary claimed to have begun working for the petitioner in March 2001. The tax returns of [REDACTED] indicate that it was incorporated on September 1, 2002. The tax returns of [REDACTED] indicate that it was incorporated on December 15, 1986. If [REDACTED] filed the labor certification as [REDACTED] petitioner has not shown that [REDACTED] is the successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]

The petitioner's name as set out on both the Form ETA 750 and the Form I-140 is [REDACTED] located at [REDACTED] and the petitioner states an Employer Identification Number [REDACTED] on the Form I-140. The petitioner submitted tax returns for two separate S corporations. The petitioner submitted tax returns for 2001 and 2002 of [REDACTED] with a location of [REDACTED] and an Employer Identification Number of [REDACTED] and tax returns for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 are for [REDACTED] and an EIN of [REDACTED]

Although based on the petitioner's representations, the petitioner and both of the corporations have the same address and the petitioner and [REDACTED] have the same EIN, no explanation appears in the record as to how the two entities are related or how [REDACTED] the petitioner should submit such evidence with any further filings. No evidence in the record shows that either [REDACTED] did or does business as [REDACTED] or that either is the successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]

---

<sup>2</sup> *Matter of Dial Auto*, 19 I & N Dec. 481 (1986), is an AAO decision designated as precedent by the Commissioner. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions are binding on all USCIS employees in the administration of the Act. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a).

By way of background, *Matter of Dial Auto* involved a petition filed by Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc. (Dial Auto) on behalf of an alien beneficiary for the position of automotive technician. The beneficiary's former employer, [REDACTED] 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 successor-in-interest issue is set forth below:

Additionally, *the representations made by the petitioner* concerning the relationship between Elvira Auto Body and itself are issues which have not been resolved. On 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.

(All emphasis added). The legacy INS and USCIS has, at times, strictly interpreted *Matter of Dial Auto* to limit a successor-in-interest finding to cases where the petitioner could show that it assumed all of the original entity's rights, duties, obligations and assets. However, a close reading of the Commissioner's decision reveals that it does not explicitly require a successor-in-interest to establish that it is assuming all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, in *Matter of Dial Auto*, the petitioner had *represented* that it had assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations, but had failed to submit requested evidence to establish that this was, in fact, true. And, if the petitioner's claim was untrue, the Commissioner stated that the underlying *labor certification* could be *invalidated for fraud or willful misrepresentation* pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.30 (1987). This is why the Commissioner said "[i]f the petitioner's claim is found to be true, *and it is determined that an actual successorship exists*, the petition could be approved." (Emphasis added.) The Commissioner was explicitly stating that the petitioner's claim that it assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations is 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 of [the alleged predecessor] and seeing a copy of "the contract or agreement between the two entities."

The petitioner must establish in any other filings the relationship of all three entities in order to establish whether any of the tax returns submitted can be used to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Additionally, we note that both [REDACTED] are separately incorporated and showing as active corporations in the New York state corporation database. [REDACTED] does not appear as a separate corporation. "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).

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA 750 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the 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'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 view of the above, *Matter of Dial Auto* did not state that a valid successor relationship could only be established through the assumption of all of a predecessor entity's rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, based on this precedent and the regulations pertaining to this visa classification, a valid successor relationship may be established if the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification; if the purported successor establishes eligibility in all respects, including the provision of evidence from the predecessor entity, such as evidence of the predecessor's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date; and if the petition fully describes and documents the transfer and assumption of the ownership of the predecessor by the claimed successor.

Evidence of transfer of ownership must show that the successor not only purchased the predecessor's assets but also that the successor acquired the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business in the same manner as the predecessor. The successor must continue to operate the same type of business as the predecessor, and the manner in which the business is controlled must remain substantially the same as it was before the ownership transfer. The successor must also establish its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from the date of business transfer until the beneficiary adjusts status to lawful permanent resident.

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.

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, although the beneficiary stated on the Form ETA 750, signed November 26, 2001, that he began working for the petitioner in March 2001, the petitioner submitted no evidence that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage, or any wages, during any relevant time frame including the period from the priority date of April 30, 2001 or subsequently.

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), *aff'd*, No. 10-1517 (6th Cir. filed Nov. 10, 2011). 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 insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. at 1084, the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now USCIS, had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns, rather than the petitioner's gross income. The court specifically rejected the argument that USCIS should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. *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).

As an alternate means of determining the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS may review the petitioner’s net current assets. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner’s current assets and current liabilities.<sup>3</sup> 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. 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 record before the director closed on June 30, 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 2006 federal income tax return was the most recent return available. As stated above, the petitioner submitted no income tax returns in the name of [REDACTED]. Because a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders, the assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation’s ability to pay the proffered wage. See *Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm’r 1980). In a similar case, the court in *Sitar v. Ashcroft*, 2003 WL 22203713 (D.Mass. Sept. 18, 2003) stated, “nothing in the governing regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 204.5, permits [USCIS] to consider the financial resources of individuals or entities who have no legal obligation to pay the wage.” Even if the financial documents from other entities could be accepted, as shown below, only the 2002 return of [REDACTED] demonstrates the ability to pay in that year. The remaining returns do not demonstrate the ability to pay the wages in any year.

---

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

<u>Year</u>	<u>Entity</u>	<u>EIN</u>	<u>Net Income</u> <sup>4</sup>	<u>Net Current Assets</u>
2001			-\$19,361 <sup>5</sup>	\$18,373
2002			\$106,784	\$0
2002			\$1,292	\$13,950
2003			-\$35,174	-\$20,752
2004			-\$14,765	-\$20,045
2005			-\$61,310	-\$22,957
2006			-\$41,942	-\$27,672

As a result, even if the financial documents from [REDACTED] are able to be considered in a determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, neither the net income or net current assets exceeded the proffered wage for either entity in 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. Only the 2002 [REDACTED] tax return demonstrated net income in excess of the proffered wage.

In addition, USCIS records indicate that the petitioner has filed two petitions for other beneficiaries since the priority date for the instant beneficiary. 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

<sup>4</sup> On appeal, counsel states that Line 1C of the tax returns, i.e. gross receipts, should be considered in determining the ability to pay the proffered wage as well as the amount on Line 8, i.e. salaries and wages. First, as stated above, gross receipts do not give the overall financial picture of the corporation as the corporation also has expenses that must be considered in determining the overall ability to pay the proffered wage. Second, the amount paid in wages to other workers is generally not available to be considered in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage as the wages paid amount to a real expense of doing business.

<sup>5</sup> Where an S corporation's income is exclusively from a trade or business, USCIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner's IRS Form 1120S. However, where an S corporation has income, credits, deductions or other adjustments from sources other than a trade or business, they are reported on Schedule K. If the Schedule K has relevant entries for additional income, credits, deductions or other adjustments, net income is found on line 23 (1997-2003), line 17e (2004-2005), and line 18 (2006-2011) of Schedule K. *See Instructions for Form 1120S*, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (accessed February 9, 2012) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholders' shares of the corporation's income, deductions, credits, etc.). Because [REDACTED] had additional adjustments shown on its Schedule K for 2001 and 2002, the net income for that entity is found on Schedule K of its tax returns. Because [REDACTED] had no additional adjustments shown on its Schedule K, its net income is found on line 21 for each year.

750 and ETA Form 9089). *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In any further filings, the petitioner should submit evidence of the proffered wages owed to the other beneficiaries, the respective priority dates, as well as evidence of any wages previously paid from their respective priority dates onwards.

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.

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 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, from the record it is not clear that any of the tax returns relate to [REDACTED]. The petitioner did not demonstrate that the tax returns of the other entities should validly be considered in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. In addition, the petitioner sponsored two other workers during the relevant time frame, but the record contains no evidence regarding their respective proffered wages or any wages paid. Counsel states that the petitioner's tax returns demonstrate that it paid more than \$100,000 in wages annually and these payments demonstrate the petitioner's ability to meet its wage obligations. In general, wages paid to others are not available to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner did not submit any W-2 statements with the initial filing or on appeal for the beneficiary despite its claims that it employed the beneficiary. 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 and continuing to the present.

In addition to the petitioner's failure to submit evidence documenting its ability to pay the proffered wage, the petitioner also did not submit sufficient evidence to establish that the beneficiary had the required experience as of the priority date. 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 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.

The petitioner submitted a letter from [REDACTED] stating that the beneficiary worked from March 1991 to September 1993 as a cook. This letter does not state the author's title, the beneficiary's job duties, nor does it state whether the beneficiary worked in a full-time or part-time capacity to sufficiently demonstrate that he possesses the full two years of experience as a cook/international. As the letter does not meet the regulatory requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3), the petition may be denied on this basis as well. In any further filings, the petitioner should submit a letter that complies with the regulations.

On appeal, counsel argues that the review undertaken by USCIS "negate[s] the validity of the Department of Labor certification" by reaching a different conclusion after reviewing the same criteria concerning "whether the beneficiary is qualified, if there are qualified lawful permanent residents or citizens workers of the United States, and if the petitioner (respondent) is qualified. . . . the Department of Labor evaluates the need of the petitioner job prospective and the affordability of

the qualifying salary.”<sup>6</sup> At the outset, DOL's certification of the Form ETA 750 does not supercede USCIS's review and evaluation of the criteria the petitioner must prove in order to establish that the petition is approvable, and that includes a review of whether or not the beneficiary is qualified for the proffered position, which in this case, is governed by section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3). DOL's role is limited to determining whether there are sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified and available and whether the employment of the alien will adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed. Section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act; 20 C.F.R. § 656.1(a).

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to DOL, or the remaining regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether or not the alien is qualified for a specific immigrant classification or even the job offered. This fact has not gone unnoticed by federal circuit courts. See *Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F. 2d 1305, 1309 (9th Cir. 1984); *Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008, 1012-1013 (D.C. Cir. 1983). Relying in part on *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008, the U.S. Federal Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Ninth Circuit) stated:

[I]t appears that the DOL is responsible only for determining the availability of suitable American workers for a job and the impact of alien employment upon the domestic labor market. It does not appear that the DOL's role extends to determining if the alien is qualified for the job for which he seeks sixth preference status. That determination appears to be delegated to the INS under section 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), as one of the determinations incident to the INS's decision whether the alien is entitled to sixth preference status.

*K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1983). The court relied on an amicus brief from DOL that stated the following:

The labor certification made by the Secretary of Labor ... pursuant to section 212(a)[(5)] of the ... [Act] ... is binding as to the findings of whether there are able, willing, qualified, and available United States workers for the job offered to the alien, and whether employment of the alien under the terms set by the employer would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed United States workers. *The labor certification in no way indicates that the alien offered the certified job opportunity is qualified (or not qualified) to perform the duties of that job.*

(Emphasis added.) *Id.* at 1009. The Ninth Circuit, citing *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006, revisited this issue, stating: “The INS, therefore, may make a de novo determination of whether the alien is in fact qualified to fill the certified job offer.” *Tongatapu*, 736 F. 2d at 1309.

---

<sup>6</sup> DOL's determination of the prevailing wage is different than the petitioner's requirement to establish that it can pay the proffered wage pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

Therefore, USCIS determines whether the beneficiary has the required education, training, and experience for the position and whether the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage.

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.