





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)





DATE **SEP 05 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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

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

Thank you,


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 a composite manufacturing company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a mold maker. 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 May 19, 2009 denial, an 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.

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 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.

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 \$7.00 per hour, which is \$14,560 per year based on forty hours of work per week. The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires six years of grade school and two years of experience in the job offered as a mold maker.

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.¹

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a C corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1995, to have a gross annual income of \$5,561,000, and to currently employ 47 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year begins on February 1 and ends on January 31. On the Form ETA 750B, the beneficiary claims to have worked for the petitioner since March 2000.

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 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 submitted copies of the beneficiary's 2000 and 2001 Forms W-2, showing that in those years the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$14,645.22 and \$10,697.53, respectively. Regarding the beneficiary's 2000 Form W-2, the AAO will not consider evidence that pre-dates the instant priority date as evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. With respect to the beneficiary's 2001 Form W-2, research conducted in all available databases revealed that the Social Security Number (SSN) listed on the beneficiary's 2001 Form W-2 is associated with other individuals, including the beneficiary.

¹ 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).

It is also noted that there is no SSN listed on Part 3 of Form I-140, filed in 2007.² 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 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988).

The petitioner also submitted copies of Forms W-2 issued by the petitioner to another individual from 2002 through 2008. The AAO notes that the name, address, and SSN listed on the 2002 through 2008 Forms W-2 do not match the beneficiary's name as listed on Form I-140 and Form ETA 750. Given the discrepancies in the beneficiary's SSN noted above, doubt is cast on whether

² 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.

the Forms W-2 of record were actually issued to the beneficiary. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's evidence may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988).

The petitioner claims that the beneficiary, [REDACTED] is also known as [REDACTED]. The petitioner submitted two affidavits to support this assertion. The first affidavit was signed by [REDACTED] on April 14, 2009. [REDACTED] certified, under penalty of perjury, that she personally has known [REDACTED] since 2000 and that he is also known as [REDACTED]. The second affidavit was signed by [REDACTED] in April 16, 2009. [REDACTED] certified, under penalty of perjury, that he personally has known [REDACTED] since 2000 and that he is also known as [REDACTED]. The statements contained in the affidavits are not supported by any documentary evidence showing that [REDACTED] are, in fact, the same individual. Adding to the confusion is the fact that both affidavits identify the beneficiary as [REDACTED] a name different than that listed on the ETA 750 and Form I-140, and his other identity as [REDACTED], a name different than that listed on the Forms W-2. 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)). USCIS may reject a fact stated in the petition if it does not believe that fact to be true. Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b); see also *Anetekhai v. I.N.S.*, 876 F.2d 1218, 1220 (5th Cir. 1989); *Lu-Ann Bakery Shop, Inc. v. Nelson*, 705 F. Supp. 7, 10 (D.D.C. 1988); *Systronics Corp. v. INS*, 153 F. Supp. 2d 7, 15 (D.D.C. 2001).

Therefore, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date in 2001 onward.

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 the Service 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).

For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income from 2001 through 2006 as shown in the table below.³

- In 2001, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$(25,413).
- In 2002, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$(42,963).
- In 2003, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$(427,155).
- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$(138,715).

³ The petitioner submitted 2 tax returns for 2003, 2004 and 2005. One tax return is labeled "As Filed," and the other is labeled "As Amended." The figures below are taken from the tax returns labeled "As Filed" for 2003, 2004 and 2005.

- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$473,459.
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$119,735.

Therefore, for the years 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

If the net income the petitioner demonstrates it had available during that period, if any, added to the wages paid to the beneficiary during the period, if any, do not equal the amount of the proffered wage or more, USCIS will review the petitioner's net current assets. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.⁴ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6 and include cash-on-hand. 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 petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets from 2001 through 2006, as shown in the table below.

- In 2001, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$(94,719).
- In 2002, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$(78,691).
- In 2003, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$(530,218).
- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$(673,967).
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$161,051.
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$68,488.

Therefore, for the years 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.

Therefore, from the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL, the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets.

On appeal, counsel submits the petitioner's bank statements and asserts that USCIS should take into consideration the petitioner's gross receipts, compensation paid to the petitioner's officers, and the petitioner's total income for all relevant years.

⁴According 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.

Counsel's reliance on the balances in the petitioner's bank account is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), required to illustrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. While this regulation allows additional material "in appropriate cases," the petitioner in this case has not demonstrated why the documentation specified at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) is inapplicable or otherwise paints an inaccurate financial picture of the petitioner. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. Third, no evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the funds reported on the petitioner's bank statements somehow reflect additional available funds that were not reflected on its tax return(s), such as the petitioner's taxable income (income minus deductions) or the cash specified on Schedule L that was considered above in determining the petitioner's net current assets.

Counsel's reliance on gross receipts and total income is equally misplaced. As discussed above, 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 the Service 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).

Regarding officers' compensation as available funds to pay the proffered wage, the petitioner's 2004 and 2005 tax returns of record do not show that the petitioner actually disbursed any amount to its officer(s) for those years. Furthermore, the petitioner failed to provide a sworn statement or affidavit from the officer(s) of the company stating they are willing to forgo officer's compensation in order to pay the proffered wage from the priority date until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. The record also does not contain photocopies of the officer's W-2s for all relevant years.

Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax returns as submitted by the petitioner that demonstrates that the petitioner could not pay the proffered wage from the day the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL.

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 *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.

In the instant case, the petitioner's tax returns indicate it was incorporated on February 3, 1995. The petitioner submitted its tax returns for years 2001 through 2006. The figures on its tax returns do not demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage of \$14,560 in 2001 through 2004. The petitioner's net income and net current assets were negative in 2001 through 2004. No evidence was provided to explain any temporary or uncharacteristic disruption in its business activities during those years. Although the petitioner has been in business since 1995, no evidence was provided to establish an outstanding reputation in the industry comparable to the petitioner in *Sonegawa*. 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.

Beyond the decision of the director,⁵ the petitioner has also not established 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)(1), (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).

⁵ 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).

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered position requires six years of grade school and two years of experience in the job offered as a mold maker. On Part B, eliciting information of the beneficiary's work experience, the beneficiary claims to qualify for the offered position based on experience gained with the petitioning company as a mold maker since March 2000. The beneficiary did not list on the labor certification whether he was a full-time or part-time employee.⁶ No other experience is listed on the labor certification.

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. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(A). The record contains a letter from the petitioner dated March 27, 2009, and signed by [REDACTED] attested to the beneficiary's employment with the petitioner since March 2000 in the position of mold maker, working full-time. [REDACTED] also stated that "due to a typographical error on ETA 750 part B, the beneficiary's prior experience was not properly noted on Section 15." [REDACTED] then referred to the beneficiary's experience as a mold maker with [REDACTED] from January 1984 until May 1986.

The petitioner also provided a letter dated April 18, 2008, signed by [REDACTED] manager with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] manager attested to the beneficiary's employment as a full-time employee from January 1984 to May 1986 in the design and fabrication of metallic molds. As the beneficiary failed to represent this experience on Form ETA 750, Part B, without independent and objective evidence of this experience, the AAO will not consider this experience to establish that the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on the labor certification application, as certified by the DOL. In *Matter of Leung*, 16 I&N Dec. 2530 (BIA 1976), the Board's dicta notes that the beneficiary's experience, without such fact certified by DOL on the beneficiary's Form ETA 750B, lessens the credibility of the evidence and facts asserted.

Regarding the experience the beneficiary claims to have gained with the petitioner, 20 C.F.R. § 656.21(b)(5) [2004] states:

The employer shall document that its requirements for the job opportunity, as described, represent the employer's *actual minimum requirements* for the job opportunity, and the **employer has not hired workers with less training or experience** for jobs similar to that involved in the job opportunity or that it is not feasible to hire workers with less training or experience than that required by the employer's job offer.

[Emphasis added.]

⁶ Although the beneficiary signed the labor certification under a declaration that the contents of the form are true and correct under the penalty of perjury, he failed to state the date he signed the labor certification.

Representations made on the certified Form ETA 750 clearly indicate that the actual minimum requirements for the offered position are two years of experience in the job offered as a mold maker and that experience in a related occupation is not acceptable. As the actual minimum requirements are two years of experience, the petitioner could not hire workers with less than three years of experience for the same position. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 656.21(b)(5) [2004]. The petitioner could not base the beneficiary's qualifications for the proffered position on experience acquired with the petitioning employer. However, in hiring the beneficiary with less than two years of experience for the position of a mold maker, the petitioner has indicated that the actual minimum requirements are, in fact, not two years of experience. Rather, in that the beneficiary can perform the job duties of the offered position with less than two years of experience, it is evident that the actual minimum requirements for the offered position are *less* than two years of experience.

In general, experience gained with the petitioner in the offered position may not be used by the beneficiary to qualify for the proffered position without invalidating the actual minimum requirements of the position, as stated by the petitioner on the Form ETA 750.⁷ In the instant case, as the beneficiary's experience gained with the petitioner was in the position offered, the petitioner cannot rely on this experience for the beneficiary to qualify for the proffered position. Additionally, as the terms of the labor certification supporting the instant I-140 petition do not permit consideration of experience in a related occupation, and the beneficiary's experience with the petitioner was in the position offered, the experience may not be used to qualify the beneficiary for the proffered position.


The evidence in the record does not establish that the beneficiary possessed the required experience set forth on the labor certification by the priority date. Therefore, the petitioner has also failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified for the offered 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

⁷ This position is supported by the Board of Alien Labor Certification Appeals (BALCA). *See Delitizer Corp. of Newton*, 88-INA-482, May 9, 1990 (BALCA):

[W]here the required experience was gained by the alien while working for the employer in jobs other than the job offered, the employer must demonstrate that the job in which the alien gained experience was not similar to the job offered for certification. Some relevant considerations on the issue of similarity include the relative job duties and supervisory responsibilities, job requirements, the positions of the jobs in the employer's job hierarchy, whether and by whom the position has been filled previously, whether the position is newly created, the prior employment practices of the Employer regarding the relative positions, the amount or percentage of time spent performing each job duty in each job, and the job salaries.

(b)(6)



Page 12

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.