

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

(b)(6)

DATE: **AUG 23 2013** OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker 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 (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center. The subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and reconsider. The motion to reconsider will be dismissed and the motion to reopen will be granted. The decision of the AAO will be affirmed.

The petitioner is a full service restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a foreign food and specialty cook. Although 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 labor certification application did not belong to the petitioner. The director also determined that the petitioner was not the successor-in-interest to the company that filed the labor certification application, [REDACTED]. 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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) states, in pertinent part: "A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be provided in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence." Additionally, a motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. The record shows that the motion to reopen is properly filed, timely, states the new facts to be proved and is supported by documentary evidence. The motion to reconsider does not establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence at the time of the initial decision. The motion to reconsider is dismissed. The motion to reopen is granted. 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 AAO's appeal dismissal, the issues in this case are whether or not the application did not belong to the petitioner. The director also determined that the petitioner was not the successor-in-interest to the company that filed the labor certification application, [REDACTED].

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 4, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$13.00 per hour (\$27,040 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the job offered.

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 an S corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to employ 40 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year.

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 (2001) 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. The petitioner on motion has provided paystubs purportedly issued to the beneficiary by the petitioner for 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. In the instant case, the petitioner has established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage in 2008, 2009, and 2010. However, in 2011 and 2012 the petitioner paid the beneficiary less

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).

than the proffered wage. However, we will consider the amounts paid to the beneficiary for 2011 and 2012 in analyzing the petitioner's net current income and assets below.

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 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).

The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2002 through 2011, as shown in the table below. However, the petitioner is required to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date (2001) onwards.

- In 2001, the Form 1120S was not submitted by the petitioner.
- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated net income² of \$9,967.
- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$22,745.
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net income of -\$16,678.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net income of -\$9,921.
- In 2006, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$49,336.
- In 2007, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$138,951.
- In 2008, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$89,480.
- In 2009, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$60,539.
- In 2010, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$109,988.
- In 2011, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$47,354.

Therefore, for the years 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

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.³ A corporation’s year-end current assets are shown

² Where an S corporation’s income is exclusively from a trade or business, USCIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner’s IRS Form 1120S. However, where an S corporation has income, credits, deductions or other adjustments from sources other than a trade or business, they are reported on Schedule K. If the Schedule K has relevant entries for additional income, credits, deductions or other adjustments, net income is found on line 23 (1997-2003) line 17e (2004-2005) line 18 (2006-2011) of Schedule K. See Instructions for Form 1120S, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (accessed 08/15/2013) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholders’ shares of the corporation’s income, deductions, credits, etc.). Because the petitioner had additional income, credits, deductions, or other adjustments shown on its Schedule K for 2002 to 2011, the petitioner’s net income is found on Schedule K of its tax returns.

³According 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.

on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If the total of a corporation's end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets for 2001 to 2005, as shown in the table below.

- In 2001, the Form 1120S was not submitted by the petitioner.
- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -106,453.
- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -\$127,678.
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -139,306.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -183,540.

Therefore, for the years 2001 - 2005, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.

USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's business activities in its determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg'l Comm'r 1967). The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about \$100,000. During the year in which the petition was filed in that case, the petitioner changed business locations and paid rent on both the old and new locations for five months. There were large moving costs and also a period of time when the petitioner was unable to do regular business. The Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner's prospects for a resumption of successful business operations were well established. The petitioner was a fashion designer whose work had been featured in *Time* and *Look* magazines. Her clients included Miss Universe, movie actresses, and society matrons. The petitioner's clients had been included in the lists of the best-dressed California women. The petitioner lectured on fashion design at design and fashion shows throughout the United States and at colleges and universities in California. The Regional Commissioner's determination in *Sonogawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonogawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of a petitioner's net income and net current assets. USCIS may consider such factors as the number of years the petitioner has been doing business, the established historical growth of the petitioner's business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry, whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service, or any other evidence that USCIS deems relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In the instant case, the petitioner claims to have been in business since 2001 and employs 40 workers. Further, the petitioner has had gross annual receipts over one million dollars for the last ten years. Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the petitioner has established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage based on a review of the petitioner's longevity in business, number of employees, gross receipts and wages already paid to the beneficiary.

The evidence submitted does establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

Therefore, from the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL, the petitioner has 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, its net income, and a totality of the circumstances examined.

On motion, the petitioner again states that because the beneficiary's Forms I-140 and I-485 petitions had been pending for more than 180 days at the time the beneficiary left her employment at [REDACTED], that the American Competitiveness in the Twenty First Century Act of 2000 (AC21) allows the beneficiary's new employer to substitute on the Form I-140 petition and utilize the certified Form ETA 750 to support the petition. The petitioner does not allege, and the AAO does not find, that the petitioner is the successor-in-interest to the company that obtained the labor certification, [REDACTED]. The issue has been previously discussed and is not contested on motion. On motion however, the petitioner seeks, through the operation of AC21, to utilize the certified Form ETA 750 of [REDACTED]. AC21 does not allow this.

The record reflects the following:

- April 4, 2001- [REDACTED] filed a Form ETA 750 on behalf of the beneficiary.
- June 17, 2002- the Form ETA 750 was approved by the DOL [REDACTED]
- October 8, 2002- Form I-140/I-485 concurrently filed by [REDACTED] and the beneficiary.⁴
- May 2, 2003- Form I-140 and Form I-485 denied by the Vermont Service Center (VSC).⁵

⁴ Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, Form I-140 (EAC-03-015-21014); Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485). The AAO notes that after the enactment of AC21, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) altered its regulations to provide for the concurrent filing of immigrant visa petitions and applications for adjustment of status. This created a possible scenario wherein after an alien's adjustment application had been pending for 180 days, the alien could receive and accept a job offer from a new employer, potentially rendering him or her eligible for AC21 portability, prior to the adjudication of his or her underlying visa petition. A USCIS memorandum signed by William Yates, May 12, 2005, provides that if the initial petition is determined "approvable", then the adjustment application may be adjudicated under the terms of AC21. See *Interim Guidance for Processing Form I-140 Employment-Based Immigrant Petitions and Form I-485 and H-1B Petitions Affected by the American Competitiveness in the Twenty-First Century Act of 2000 (AC21) (Public Law 106-313)* at 3. This memorandum was superseded by *Matter of Al Wazzan*, 25 I&N Dec. 359 (AAO 2010), which determined that the petition must have been valid to begin with if it is to remain valid with respect to a new job.

⁵ The Director found that [REDACTED] did not establish its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onwards. The petitioner did not appeal.

- February 23, 2005- the petitioner filed a Form I-140 (EAC-05-098-53012) on behalf of the beneficiary.
- November 2, 2005- Form I-140 denied by the VSC.⁶
- October 5, 2007- the petitioner filed the instant Form I-140 on behalf of the beneficiary.
- April 24, 2009- the Nebraska Service Center (NSC) denied the Form I-140.
- May 26, 2009- the petitioner appealed the NSC's decision.
- September 6, 2012- the AAO dismissed the appeal.
- October 4, 2012- the petitioner filed a motion to reopen and motion to reconsider the AAO's decision.

On motion, the petitioner asserts that the petition is still "approvable" under the provisions of AC21. The AAO does not agree that the terms of AC21 make it so that the instant *immigrant petition* can be approved despite the fact that the petitioner has not demonstrated its eligibility. As noted above, AC21 allows an *application for adjustment of status* to be approved despite the fact that the initial job offer is no longer valid. The language of AC21 states that the I-140 "shall remain valid" with respect to a new job offer for purposes of the beneficiary's application for adjustment of status despite the fact that he or she no longer intends to work for the petitioning entity provided (1) the application for adjustment of status based upon the initial visa petition must have been pending for more than 180 days and (2) the new job offer the new employer must be for a "same or similar" job. A plain reading of the phrase "will remain valid" suggests that the petition must be valid *prior* to any consideration of whether or not the adjustment application was pending more than 180 days and/or the new position is same or similar. In other words, it is not possible for a petition to remain valid if it is not valid currently. The AAO would not consider a petition wherein the initial petitioner has not demonstrated its eligibility to be a valid petition for purposes of section 106(c) of AC21. This position is supported by the fact that when AC21 was enacted, USCIS regulations required that the underlying I-140 was approved prior to the beneficiary filing for adjustment of status. When AC21 was enacted, the only time that an application for adjustment of status could have been pending for 180 days was when it was filed based on an approved immigrant petition. Therefore, the only possible meaning for the term "remains valid" was that the underlying petition was approved and would not be invalidated by the fact that the job offer was no longer a valid offer. *See Matter of Al Wazzan*, 25 I&N Dec. 359 (AAO 2010).

Statutory interpretation begins with the language of the statute itself. *Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare v. Davenport*, 495 U.S. 552 (1990). We are expected to give the words used in the statute their ordinary meaning. *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984). Furthermore, we are to construe the language in question in harmony with the thrust of related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *K Mart Corp. v. Cartier Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996).

⁶ The Director found that the provisions of AC21 did not apply and that the petitioner was not a successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]

With regard to the overall design of the nation's immigration laws, section 204 of the Act provides the basic statutory framework for the granting of immigrant status. Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(F), provides that “[a]ny employer desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification under section . . . 203(b)(3) . . . of this title may file a petition with the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] for such classification.” (Emphasis added.)

Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), governs USCIS's authority to approve an immigrant visa petition before immigrant status is granted:

After an investigation of the facts in each case . . . the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is . . . eligible for preference under subsection (a) or (b) of section 203, approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

Statute and regulations allow adjustment only where the alien has an approved petition for immigrant classification. Section 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a); 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2).⁷

Pursuant to the statutory framework for the granting of immigrant status, any United States employer desiring and intending to employ an alien “entitled” to immigrant classification under the Act “may file” a petition for classification. Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(F). However, section 204(b) of the Act mandates that USCIS approve that petition only after investigating the facts in each case, determining that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien is eligible for the requested classification. Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). Hence, Congress specifically granted USCIS the sole authority to approve an immigrant visa petition; an alien may not adjust status or be granted immigrant status by the Department of State until USCIS approves the petition.

Therefore, to be considered “valid” in harmony with the portability provisions of AC21 and with the statute as a whole, an immigrant visa petition must have been filed for an alien that is entitled to the requested classification and that petition must have been approved by USCIS pursuant to the agency's authority under the Act. *See generally* section 204 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154. A petition is not validated merely through the act of filing the petition with USCIS or through the passage of 180 days.

⁷ We note that the Act contains at least one provision that does apply to pending petitions; in that instance, Congress specifically used the word “pending.” *See* section 101(a)(15)(V) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(V) (establishing a nonimmigrant visa for aliens with family-based petitions that have been pending three years or more).

The portability provisions of AC21 cannot be interpreted as allowing the adjustment of status of an alien based on an unapproved visa petition when section 245(a) of the Act explicitly requires an approved petition (or eligibility for an immediately available immigrant visa) in order to grant adjustment of status. To construe section 204(j) of the Act in that manner would violate the “elementary canon of construction that a statute should be interpreted so as not to render one part inoperative.” *Dept. of Revenue of Or. v. ACF Indus., Inc.*, 510 U.S. 332, 340 (1994).

We will not construe section 204(j) of the Act in a manner that would allow ineligible aliens to gain immigrant status simply by filing visa petitions and adjustment applications, thereby increasing USCIS backlogs, in the hopes that the application might remain unadjudicated for 180 days.⁸

The enactment of the job flexibility provision at section 204(j) of the Act did not repeal or modify sections 204(b) and 245(a) of the Act, which require USCIS to approve an immigrant visa petition prior to granting adjustment of status.

Every petition filed to classify an alien beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant under section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Act must be accompanied by an individual labor certification issued by DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(i). Without an appropriate certification from DOL, the AAO is without statutory authority to approve a petitioner’s employment-based third preference immigrant petition.

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 motion to reopen is granted and the decision of the AAO dated September 6, 2012 is affirmed. The petition’s denial is undisturbed.

⁸ Moreover, every federal circuit court of appeals that has discussed the portability provision of section 204(j) of the Act has done so only in the context of deciding an immigration judge’s jurisdiction to determine the continuing validity of an approved visa petition when adjudicating an alien’s application for adjustment of status in removal proceedings. *Sung v. Keisler*, 2007 WL 3052778 (5th Cir. Oct. 22, 2007); *Matovski v. Gonzales*, 492 F.3d 722 (6th Cir. Jun. 15, 2007); *Perez-Vargas v. Gonzales*, 478 F.3d 191 (4th Cir. 2007). In *Sung*, the court quoted section 204(j) of the Act and explained that the provision only addresses when “an *approved* immigration petition will remain valid for the purpose of an application of adjustment of status.” *Sung*, 2007 WL 3052778 at *1 (emphasis added). *Accord Matovski*, 492 F.3d at 735 (discussing portability as applied to an alien who had a “previously approved I-140 Petition for Alien Worker”); *Perez-Vargas*, 478 F.3d at 193 (stating that “[s]ection 204(j) . . . provides relief to the alien who changes jobs after his visa petition has been approved”). Hence, the requisite approval of the underlying visa petition is explicit in each of these decisions.