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

(b)(6)

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Date: MAY 25 2012 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a 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,

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.[1]

The petitioner is a car wash. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an assistant manager. 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 I-140 petition was submitted without all of the required initial evidence, specifically evidence that the beneficiary met the experience requirement of the labor certification, and evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. 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 April 1, 2009 denial, the petitioner failed to submit all required initial evidence, including evidence that the beneficiary met the experience requirements of the labor certification, and evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

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.[2]

---

[1] Although the Form I-140 petition was prepared by and the Form I-290B lists the address and e-mail of no Form G-28, Notice of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, was submitted with either form. A review of recognized organizations and accredited representatives reported in April 2012 by the Executive Office for Immigration Review at http://www.justice.gov/eoir/statspub/raroster_files/raroster_orgs_reps_state_city.htm (accessed May 18, 2012), does not mention or Under 8 C.F.R. § 292.1, persons entitled to represent individuals in matters before the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"), and the Immigration Courts and Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board"), or the DHS alone, include, among others, accredited representatives. Any such representatives must be designated by a qualified organization, as recognized by the Board. A recognized organization must apply to the Board for accreditation of such a representative or representatives.

[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 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 as of December 31, 2003, the priority date, as well as evidence that the beneficiary met the requirements of Form ETA 750, and therefore, the director was not obligated to issue a Request for Evidence (RFE) seeking the missing initial evidence of the petitioner's eligibility.

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a letter describing its business, the beneficiary's Forms W-2 from 2003 to 2008, the beneficiary's pay stubs for April and May 2009, and a letter of experience from No other evidence was provided.

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. In a case where the prospective United States employer employs 100 or more workers, the director may accept a statement from a financial officer of the organization which establishes the prospective employer's ability to pay the proffered wage. In appropriate cases, additional evidence, such as profit/loss statements, bank account records, or personnel records, may be submitted by the petitioner or requested by the Service.

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).

---

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).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on December 31, 2003. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is $2,036.36 per month ($24,436.32 per year, based on twelve months of work per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the offered position as an assistant manager.

The petitioner failed to submit any regulatory prescribed evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1980 and to currently employ twenty-seven workers. On appeal, the petitioner claims to currently employ sixty workers. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on December 26, 2003, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner as a full-time assistant manager from July 1996 to present.[3]

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 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 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 has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage during any relevant timeframe including the period from the priority date in 2003 or subsequently. Although the petitioner submitted copies of Forms W-2 issued to the beneficiary from 2003 through 2008, and pay stubs issued to the beneficiary in April and May 2009, none of the Forms W-2 or pay stubs were issued to the beneficiary by the petitioner, Rainbow Car Wash. No evidence was submitted to establish any relationship between the petitioner and the entities that issued the Forms W-2 and pay stubs. The AAO will not accept evidence of wages paid by entities other than the petitioner, as evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Therefore, the beneficiary's Forms W-2 and pay stubs will not be accepted as evidence of any wages paid to the beneficiary by the petitioner.[4] The

---

[3] The AAO will consider this date to be at least until the date the beneficiary signed the labor certification on December 26, 2003.

[4] The AAO notes that the Social Security number (SSN) listed on the beneficiary's 2008 Forms W-2 does not match the SSN listed on the beneficiary's Forms W-2 for 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007. Research conducted in all available databases revealed that the SSNs listed on the beneficiary's Forms

petitioner has not demonstrated that it employed and paid the beneficiary during any relevant period from the priority date in 2003 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,

---

W-2 are associated with other individuals. On Part 3 of the I-140 filed on December 13, 2007, the petitioner indicated that the beneficiary does not have a SSN. It is incumbent upon 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. *Id.*

Misuse of another individual's SSN is a violation of Federal law and may lead to fines and/or imprisonment and disregarding the work authorization provisions printed on your Social Security card may be a violation of Federal immigration law. Violations of applicable law regarding Social Security Number fraud and misuse are serious crimes and will be subject to prosecution. The following provisions of law deal directly with Social Security number fraud and misuse:

• **Social Security Act:** In December 1981, Congress passed a bill to amend the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 to restore minimum benefits under the Social Security Act. In addition, the Act made it a felony to...*willfully, knowingly, and with intent to deceive the Commissioner of Social Security as to his true identity (or the true identity of any other person) furnishes or causes to be furnished false information to the Commissioner of Social Security with respect to any information required by the Commissioner of Social Security in connection with the establishment and maintenance of the records provided for in section 405(c)(2) of this title.*
Violators of this provision, Section 208(a)(6) of the Social Security Act, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined under title 18 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. *See* the website at http://www.ssa.gov/OP_Home/ssact/title02/0208.htm (accessed on April 26, 2011).

• **Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act:** In October 1998, Congress passed the Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act (Public Law 105-318) to address the problem of identity theft. Specifically, the Act made it a Federal crime when anyone...*knowingly transfers or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person with the intent to commit, or to aid or abet, any unlawful activity that constitutes a violation of Federal law, or that constitutes a felony under any applicable State or local law.*

Violations of the Act are investigated by Federal investigative agencies such as the U.S. Secret Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the U.S. Postal Inspection Service and prosecuted by the Department of Justice.

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 receipts and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross receipts 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 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* 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.[5] 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.

On appeal, the petitioner stated in a letter dated May 21, 2009 that, due to a nondisclosure policy, tax and financial statements cannot be provided. The petitioner failed to provide one of the three types of evidence set forth by the regulations under 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). This evidence would have demonstrated the amount of taxable income the petitioner reported to the IRS and further reveal its ability to pay the proffered wage. Failure to submit the evidence set forth in the regulations prevents the AAO from examining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary by the petitioner, or its net income or net current assets. The petitioner's failure to submit these documents cannot be excused. The failure to submit required evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

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 Sonegawa,* 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg'l Comm'r 1967). The petitioning entity in *Sonegawa* 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 *Sonegawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonegawa*, 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.

---

[5] According 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 the instant case, the petitioner failed to provide regulatory prescribed evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage. The evidence of record does not allow the AAO to conduct a totality of the circumstances analysis based on *Sonegawa.* The petitioner submitted no evidence that it enjoys a reputation like that in *Sonegawa.* Thus, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date to present.

Also noted by the director in the April 1, 2009, denial, the petitioner has also not demonstrated by credible evidence that the beneficiary is qualified for the offered position. The petitioner must establish that the beneficiary possessed all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the priority date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(l), (12). *See Matter of Wing's Tea House,* 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977); *see also Matter of Katigbak,* 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg'l Comm'r 1971). 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).

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 beneficiary's claimed qualifying experience must be supported by letters from employers giving the name, address, and title of the employer, and a description of the beneficiary's experience.

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered position requires two years of experience in the job offered as an assistant manager. On the labor certification, the beneficiary claimed to qualify for the offered position based on experience gained with [redacted]

located at [redacted] as a full-time manager from February 1992 to December 1995. On the labor certification, the beneficiary also listed his employment with the petitioner as a full-time assistant manager since July 1996.[6]

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a letter dated January 17, 1995, signed by [redacted] Senior VP of Corporate Finances with [redacted] attested to the beneficiary's employment as a car wash manager from February 3, 1992 to December 22, 1995. Although the letter listed the duties performed by the beneficiary, it does not mention whether the beneficiary was a full-time or part-time manager. Therefore, the actual amount of experience gained by the beneficiary cannot be calculated.

The petitioner failed to establish by credible and preponderant evidence that the beneficiary met the minimum requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification as of the priority date. Therefore, the beneficiary does not qualify for classification as a professional or skilled worker under section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Act.

Beyond the decision of the director,[7] it is unclear that the petitioner will be the beneficiary's actual employer. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(c) provides that "[a]ny United States employer desiring and intending to employ an alien may file a petition for classification of the alien under…section 203(b)(3) of the Act." In addition, the Department of Labor (DOL) regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.3[8] states:

> *Employer* means a person, association, firm, or a corporation which currently has a location within the United States to which U.S. workers may be referred for employment, and which proposes to employ a full-time worker at a place within the

---

[6] Although the beneficiary claimed on Form ETA 750B to have been employed with the petitioner since 1996, none of the Forms W-2 for the years 2003 through 2008 were issued to the beneficiary by the petitioner. 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] 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).

[8] 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. The current DOL regulations concerning labor certifications went into effect on March 28, 2005. The new regulations are referred to by the 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.

United States or the authorized representative of such a person, association, firm, or corporation.

The petitioner submitted multiple Forms W-2, issued to the beneficiary from 2003 to 2008 by different companies with different Federal Employer Identification Numbers (FEIN). The Forms W-2 provide the following information:

- In 2008 the beneficiary received $14,350 from located at
- In 2008 the beneficiary received $9,875 from
- In 2007 the beneficiary received $31,200 from
- In 2006 the beneficiary received $33,800 from
- In 2005 the beneficiary received $17,700 from
- In 2005 the beneficiary received $2,470 from
- In 2005 the beneficiary received $6,630
- In 2004 the beneficiary received $21,600 from
- In 2003 the beneficiary received $21,600 from

The record also contains the beneficiary's paystubs for April and May 2009 from both

Public Records information reveals that the petitioner's address claimed on the Form I-140 petition and Form ETA 750 is related to multiple businesses.[12]

---

[9] This is the same address and FEIN claimed by the petitioner on Part 1 of Form I-140.
[10] This is the same address and FEIN claimed by the petitioner on Part 1 of Form I-140.
[11] This is the same address and FEIN claimed by the petitioner on Part 1 of Form I-140.

A search of the California Secretary of State Website reveals that were incorporated on April 1, 2008. The three companies have the same registered address of and the same registered agent, Further research reveals that was purchased by owned by President of the petitioner. No evidence was submitted to establish a relationship between and the instant petitioner, although the record reflects they share the same address and FEIN. In this case, the petitioner has failed to establish what company will actually employ the beneficiary and failed to provide information about its relationship, if any, with some or all the companies shown on the beneficiary's Forms W-2 of record.

In determining whether there is an "employee-employer relationship," the Supreme Court of the United States has determined that where a federal statute fails to clearly define the term "employee," courts should conclude "that Congress intended to describe the conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine." *Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. v. Darden*, 503 U.S. 318, 322-323 (1992) (hereinafter "*Darden*") (quoting *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. 730 (1989)). That definition is as follows:

> In determining whether a hired party is an employee under the general common law of agency, we consider the hiring party's right to control the manner and means by which the product is accomplished. Among the other factors relevant to this inquiry are the skill required; the source of the instrumentalities and tools; the location of the work; the duration of the relationship between the parties; whether the hiring party has the right to assign additional projects to the hired party; the extent of the hired party's discretion over when and how long to work; the method of payment; the hired party's role in hiring and paying assistants; whether the work is part of the regular business of the hiring party; whether the hiring party is in business; the provision of employee benefits; and the tax treatment of the hired party.

Darden, 503 U.S. at 323-324; *see also* Restatement (Second) of Agency § 220(2) (1958); *Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates, P.C. v. Wells*, 538 U.S. 440 (2003) (hereinafter "*Clackamas*"). As the common-law test contains "no shorthand formula or magic phrase that can be applied to find the answer, ... all of the incidents of the relationship must be assessed and weighed with no one factor

---

[12] On the Form I-140 and the Form ETA 750, the petitioner lists its address as . This address matches the address on the letter from the petitioner dated May 21, 2009. Both the I-140 petition and the Form ETA 750 state that this is the address where the beneficiary will work. A search on Google Maps indicated that a business named (accessed April 21, 2012). No evidence was submitted to establish a relationship between the petitioner and .

being decisive." *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324 (quoting *NLRB v. United Ins. Co. of America*, 390 U.S. 254, 258 (1968)).

In considering whether or not one is an "employee," U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) must focus on the common-law touchstone of control. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. Factors indicating that a worker is an "employee" of an "employer" are clearly delineated in both the *Darden* and *Clackamas* decisions. 503 U.S. at 323-324; *see also* Restatement (Second) of Agency § 220(2) (1958). Such indicia of control include when, where, and how a worker performs the job; the continuity of the worker's relationship with the employer; the tax treatment of the worker; the provision of employee benefits; and whether the work performed by the worker is part of the employer's regular business. *See Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; *cf.* New Compliance Manual, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, § 2-III(A)(1), (EEOC 2006) (adopting a materially identical test and indicating that said test was based on the *Darden* decision).

It is important to note that the factors listed in *Darden* and *Clackamas* are not exhaustive and must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Other aspects of the relationship between the parties may affect the determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists. Furthermore, not all or even a majority of the listed criteria need be met; however, the fact finder must weigh and compare a combination of the factors in analyzing the facts of each individual case. The determination must be based on all of the circumstances in the relationship between the parties, regardless of whether the parties refer to it as an employee or as an independent contractor relationship. *See Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; New Compliance Manual at § 2-III(A)(1).

In the present matter, it is unclear that the petitioning entity pays any employee salaries, that it employs anyone directly, or that it would be the beneficiary's actual employer.

In *Clackamas*, the specific inquiry was whether four physicians, actively engaged in medical practice as shareholders, could be considered employees to determine whether the petitioner to qualify as an employer under the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), which necessitates an employer have fifteen employees. The court cites to *Darden* that "We have often been asked to construe the meaning of 'employee' where the statute containing the term does not helpfully define it." *Clackamas,* 538 U.S. at 444, (*citing Darden*, 503 U.S. at 318, 322). The court found the regulatory definition to be circular in that the ADA defined an "employee" as "individual employed by the employer." *Id. (citing* 42 U.S.C. § 12111(4)). Similarly, in *Darden,* where the court considered whether an insurance salesman was an independent contractor or an "employee" covered by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), the court found the ERISA definition to be circular and adopted a common-law test to determine who would qualify as an "employee under ERISA. *Id.* (*citing Darden*, 503 U.S. at 323). In looking to *Darden,* the court stated, "as *Darden* reminds us, congressional silence often reflects an expectation that courts will look to the common law to fill gaps in statutory text, particularly when an undefined term has a settled meaning in common law. Congress has overridden judicial decisions that went beyond the common law." *Id.* at 447 *(citing Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324-325).

The *Clackamas* court considered the common law definition of the master-servant relationship, which focuses on the master's control over the servant. The court cites to definition of "servant" in the Restatement (Second) of Agency § 2(2) (1958): "a servant is a person employed to perform services in the affairs of another and who with respect to the physical conduct in the performance of services is subject to the other's control or right to control."[13] *Id.* at 448. The Restatement additionally lists factors for consideration when distinguishing between servants and independent contractors, "the first of which is 'the extent of control' that one may exercise over the details of the work of the other." *Id. (citing* § 220(2)(a)). The court also looked to the EEOC's focus on control[14] in *Skidmore v. Swift & Co.*, 323 U.S. 134, 140 (1944) and that the EEOC considered an employer can hire and fire employees, assign tasks to employees and supervise their performance, can decide how the business' profits and losses are distributed. *Id.* at 449-450.

Due to the inconsistencies noted above, it is unclear that the petitioner will be the beneficiary's actual employer. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is

---

[13] Section 220, Definition of a Servant, in full states:

(1) A servant is a person employed to perform services in the affairs of another and who with respect to the physical conduct in the performance of the services is subject to the other's control or right to control.

(2) In determining whether one acting for another is a servant or an independent contractor, the following matters of fact, among others, are considered:

a. The extent of control which, by the agreement, the master may exercise over the details of the work;
b. Whether or not the one employed is engaged in a distinct occupation or business;
c. The kind of occupation, with reference to whether, in the locality, the work is usually done under the director of the employer or by a specialist without supervision;
d. The skill required in the occupation;
e. Whether the employer or the workman supplies the instrumentalities, tools, and the place of work for the person doing the work;
f. The length of time for which the person is employed;
g. The method of payment, whether by the time or by the job;
h. Whether or not the work is a part of the regular business of the employer;
i. Whether or not the parties believe they are creating the relation of master and servant; and
j. Whether the principal is or is not in business.

[14] Additionally, as set forth in the recent Memorandum from Donald Neufeld, Associate Director, Service Center Operations, Determining Employer-Employee Relationship for Adjudication of H-1B Petitions, Including Third Party Site Placements, HQ 70/6.2.8, January 8, 2010, the memo looks to whether the employer has the "right to control" where, when and how the beneficiary performs the job. The memo considers many of the factors set forth in *Darden, Clackamas,* and the Restatement, including who provides the tools necessary to perform the job duties, control to the extent of who hires, pays and fires, if necessary, the beneficiary, and who controls the manner and means by which the beneficiary's work product is completed.

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).

Therefore, the petition must also be denied because the petitioner failed to establish that it will actually employ the beneficiary.

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.