


(b)(6)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services




DATE: FEB 21 2013

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.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center (director), denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed the decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be rejected.

The petitioner describes itself as a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a shift manager. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a professional or skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A).

The petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The priority date of the petition, which is the date the DOL accepted the labor certification for processing, is April 30, 2001. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

The director's decision denying the petition concludes that the petitioner did not demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date until the beneficiary obtains permanent residence.

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 labor certification is evidence of an individual alien's admissibility under section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act, which provides:

In general.-Any alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor is inadmissible, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General that-

(I) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified (or equally qualified in the case of an alien described in clause (ii)) and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and

(II) the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(i) stipulates: "Every petition under this classification must be accompanied by an individual labor certification from the Department of Labor..."

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). See *Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

The petition was filed on February 6, 2007 without a labor certification approved by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). On June 29, 2007, counsel for the petitioner submitted Form ETA 750 which had just been certified on June 4, 2007. Therefore, at the time the petitioner filed Form I-140, the petitioner did not have a certified Form ETA 750 from the DOL. As the filing of the instant case was three months prior to the certification of the labor certification, the petition was, therefore, filed without a valid labor certification pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(i).

The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) delegates the authority to adjudicate appeals to the AAO pursuant to the authority vested in her through the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-296. See DHS Delegation Number 0150.1 (effective March 1, 2003); see also 8 C.F.R. § 2.1 (2003). The AAO exercises appellate jurisdiction over the matters described at 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii) (as in effect on February 28, 2003). See DHS Delegation Number 0150.1(U) *supra*; 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(iv).

Among the appellate authorities are appeals from denials of petitions for immigrant visa classification based on employment, "except when the denial of the petition is based upon lack of a certification by the Secretary of Labor under section 212(a)(5)(A) of the Act." 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii)(B) (2003 ed.).


As the labor certification was not valid until three months after the I-140 petition was filed, the petition is not accompanied by a valid labor certification, and this office lacks jurisdiction to consider an appeal from the director's decision.

Even if the AAO could assume jurisdiction over this matter, the AAO concurs with the director's determination that the petitioner has failed to establish its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

In the director's June 11, 2010 denial, he found that the petitioner had not demonstrated the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage in 2001, 2002 or 2003, through a consideration of the petitioner's net income, net current assets or wages paid to the beneficiary. On appeal, the petitioner has not overcome this basis for the denial of the petition. However, beyond the issue of the petitioner's ability to pay the beneficiary of the instant petition, according to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records and the owner of the petitioning entity's testimony, the petitioner has filed at least 34 I-140 petitions on behalf of other beneficiaries. Accordingly, the petitioner must establish that it has had the continuing ability to pay the combined proffered wages to each beneficiary from the priority date of the instant petition. See *Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977).

The evidence in the record does not document the priority date, proffered wage or wages paid to each beneficiary, whether any of the other petitions have been withdrawn, revoked, or denied, or whether any of the other beneficiaries have obtained lawful permanent residence. Thus, it is also concluded that the petitioner has not established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary and the proffered wages to the beneficiaries of its other petitions.

(b)(6)



Page 4

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.