

(b)(6)

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

Date: **MAY 04 2012** Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]  
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:

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,

*Kerian S. Poulos for*

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 individual. He seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a landscaper. 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 submitted all of the required initial evidence including evidence that he had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition and evidence that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and 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 February 18, 2009 denial, the issues in this case are 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 and whether or not the petitioner has demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position.

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

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

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the Form ETA 750, 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).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on April 30, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$14.28 per hour (\$29,702 per year).

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 evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is an individual. Although the petitioner indicated in Part 5 of the I-140 and on line 8 of the Form ETA 750 that the petitioning company is a landscaping business, there is no evidence that the petitioner operates a landscaping business. The petitioner's individual federal income tax returns from 2001 to 2007 do not indicate any self-employment taxes paid and do not include Schedule C. Further, the petitioner's individual federal income tax returns all list his occupation as either [REDACTED] driver or retired. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on April 16, 2001, and amended by the DOL on November 6, 2006, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner since November 1987.

The petitioner must establish that his 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 Sonegawa*, 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 he 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 has not established that he employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date in April 30, 2001 onwards. Although a copy of the beneficiary's 2007 individual federal income tax return was submitted as evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the beneficiary, the tax return does not include copies of IRS Forms W-2 or 1099-MISC, cancelled checks or any other evidence to document that the beneficiary's income was paid by the petitioner. 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)).

---

<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).

Further, the AAO notes that on page two in the section that asks for the individual's occupation, the beneficiary's tax return lists [REDACTED]. Consistent with this, line 58 lists self-employment tax and the tax return includes a Schedule C detailing the beneficiary's profit and loss from his gardening and landscaping business. This is inconsistent with counsel's assertion that the beneficiary's tax return is evidence of the petitioner having employed and paid the beneficiary.<sup>2</sup> 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 record does not contain evidence or any explanation to resolve the inconsistencies.

If the petitioner does not establish that he 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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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).

The petitioner is an individual. Therefore the individual's adjusted gross income, assets and liabilities are also considered as part of the petitioner's ability to pay. Individuals report income and expenses on their IRS Form 1040 federal tax return each year. Individuals must show that they can cover their existing expenses as well as pay the proffered wage out of their adjusted gross income or other available funds. In addition, individuals must show that they can sustain themselves and their dependents. *See Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

In *Ubeda*, 539 F. Supp. at 650, the court concluded that it was highly unlikely that a petitioner could support himself, his spouse and five dependents on a gross income of slightly more than \$20,000 where the beneficiary's proposed salary was \$6,000 or approximately thirty percent (30%) of the petitioner's gross income.

In the instant case, the petitioner supports a family of two. On appeal, the petitioner has submitted his individual federal income tax returns for 2000 to 2007. The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, April 30, 2001. The

---

<sup>2</sup> The record does not contain an IRS Form 1099-MISC indicating that the petitioner paid the beneficiary as an independent contractor in 2007.

2000 tax return precedes the priority date and is not evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during the given period.

The petitioner's tax returns reflect the following information for 2001 to 2007:

- In 2001, adjusted gross income (Form 1040, line 33) of \$51,732.
- In 2002, adjusted gross income (Form 1040, line 35) of \$59,864.
- In 2003, adjusted gross income (Form 1040, line 34) of \$68,770.
- In 2004, adjusted gross income (Form 1040, line 36) of \$217,897.
- In 2005, adjusted gross income (Form 1040, line 37) of \$78,225.
- In 2006, adjusted gross income (Form 1040, line 37) of \$53,501.
- In 2007, adjusted gross income (Form 1040, line 37) of \$65,573.

Although the petitioner's adjusted gross income exceeds the amount of the proffered wage each year, no evidence was submitted to document the petitioner's expenses required to sustain himself and his dependents. Without evidence of the petitioner's expenses, it cannot be determined what portion of the petitioner's adjusted gross income is available to pay the proffered wage.

USCIS may consider evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of his adjusted gross income 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).<sup>3</sup> USCIS may consider such factors as any uncharacteristic expenditures or losses incurred by the petitioner, whether the beneficiary is replacing a former household worker 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, no evidence was provided regarding uncharacteristic expenditures or losses incurred by the petitioner. No evidence was provided to document that the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service. No other evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability to pay was submitted. Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that he had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director abused his discretion by not requesting additional evidence after determining that all required evidence was not submitted with the initial petition. However, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(ii) states in pertinent part:

*Initial evidence.* If all required initial evidence is not submitted with the application or petition or does not demonstrate eligibility, USCIS in its discretion may deny the application or petition for lack of initial evidence or for ineligibility or request that the missing initial evidence be submitted within a specified period of time as determined by USCIS.

In the instant case, the petitioner failed to submit initial evidence of its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage with the petition, and therefore, the director was not obligated to issue a Request for Evidence (RFE) seeking the missing initial evidence of the petitioner's eligibility.

The director also determined that the petitioner had not submitted required initial evidence to establish that the beneficiary qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position.

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). Here, the labor certification application was accepted on April 30, 2001.

On appeal, counsel did not submit any evidence of the beneficiary's experience. The record does not contain any other evidence relevant to the beneficiary's qualifications other than the beneficiary's own statement regarding his experience in Part B of the ETA 750.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director abused his discretion by not requesting additional evidence after determining that all required evidence was not submitted with the initial petition. However, as previously noted, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(ii) states in pertinent part:

*Initial evidence.* If all required initial evidence is not submitted with the application or petition or does not demonstrate eligibility, USCIS in its discretion may deny the application or petition for lack of initial evidence or for ineligibility or request that the missing initial evidence be submitted within a specified period of time as determined by USCIS.

In the instant case, the petitioner failed to submit initial evidence that the beneficiary qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position, and therefore, the director was not obligated to issue an RFE seeking the missing initial evidence of the petitioner's eligibility.

To determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for an employment based immigrant visa, USCIS must examine whether the alien's credentials meet the requirements set forth in the labor certification. In

evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. See *Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant*, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm'r 1986). See also, *Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008, (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981). According to the plain terms of the labor certification, the applicant must have 6 years of grade school education and 2 years of experience in the job offered.<sup>4</sup>

The beneficiary set forth his credentials on the labor certification and signed his name under a declaration that the contents of the form are true and correct under the penalty of perjury. On the section of the labor certification eliciting information of the beneficiary's work experience, he represented that he worked as a gardener for [REDACTED] in Los Angeles, California from April 1985 to October 1987 and as a landscaper for the petitioner from November 1987 to the present. No evidence was provided to document the beneficiary's work experience.

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 AAO affirms the director's decision that the preponderance of the evidence does not demonstrate that the beneficiary acquired two years of experience in the job offered from the evidence submitted into this record of proceeding.

No letters from employers were submitted to describe the beneficiary's experience. The beneficiary's own description of his experience on the Form ETA 750 is self-serving and does not provide independent, objective evidence of his prior work experience. See *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N

---

<sup>4</sup> The petitioner did not submit evidence of the beneficiary's grade school education, and the beneficiary indicated that he had no education on Form ETA 750B. Therefore, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary has the required education for the proffered job.

Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988)(states that the petitioner must resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent, objective evidence). 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)).

Thus, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position.

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.