


(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: **JAN 31 2013** OFFICE: TEXAS 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,

Ron Rosenberg for

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center (director), and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a Japanese restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a Japanese specialty cook. The record contains a duplicate copy of Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL).¹ 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 also noted that the petitioner submitted tax returns for a different entity for 2003 and 2004. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's June 9, 2009 denial, at 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 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

The employer listed on the Form ETA 750 is [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. The address where the alien will work is listed as [REDACTED]. On the petition, the petitioner listed its name as [REDACTED] with employer identification number (EIN) [REDACTED] located at the [REDACTED] address.

¹ The record of proceeding does not contain the original Form ETA 750. The petitioner indicates that it never received the document from the DOL. The AAO received a duplicate copy of the labor certification from the DOL on January 4, 2013.

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 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).

On May 1, 2009, the director issued a request for evidence (RFE) affording the petitioner an opportunity to submit evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage as of the September 5, 2003 priority date. In a response received on June 1, 2009, the petitioner submitted IRS Forms 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return, for 2003 and 2004 from the [REDACTED] with EIN [REDACTED]. The petitioner also submitted IRS Forms 1120 for [REDACTED] with EIN [REDACTED] for the years 2005 through 2008.

On appeal, counsel states that [REDACTED] was established as a sole proprietorship in 1994 by [REDACTED]. Counsel states that the sole proprietorship filed the labor certification on behalf of the beneficiary in 2003. Counsel further states that on December 31, 2004, the sole proprietorship, [REDACTED] became [REDACTED]. In support of this claim, counsel submits an affidavit from [REDACTED] and stock certificate number one that indicates that as of December 13, 2004, [REDACTED] owns 1000 shares of [REDACTED]. The submitted certificate of incorporation from the office of the Secretary of State of the State of Texas indicates that [REDACTED] was incorporated on December 31, 2004 and that 1000 shares of stock are authorized. Thus, it appears that [REDACTED] 1000 shares represent 100% ownership of [REDACTED].

Also on appeal, counsel indicates that his office mistook [REDACTED] as the company that preceded [REDACTED]. Counsel states that the [REDACTED] was a different company, operating at [REDACTED]. Counsel indicates that the [REDACTED] is irrelevant in this matter.³ Thus, it appears that the 2003 and 2004 Forms 1120 submitted in response to the director's RFE are also irrelevant.

Thus, in summary, counsel asserts that from the priority date until December 31, 2004, the petitioner was structured as a sole proprietorship doing business as ' [REDACTED] or ' [REDACTED] with EIN [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED], doing business as [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] with EIN [REDACTED] is the successor-in-interest to that sole proprietorship.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has not issued regulations governing immigrant visa petitions filed by a successor-in-interest employer. Instead, such matters are adjudicated in accordance with *Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 481 (Comm'r 1986) ("*Matter of Dial Auto*") a binding, legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) decision that was designated as a precedent by the Commissioner in 1986. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions are binding on all immigration officers in the administration of the Act.

³ The AAO notes that in his affidavit dated July 3, 2009, Tae W. Park refers to a merger of [REDACTED] Inc. and the petitioner. Further, in a letter dated June 26, 2009 from [REDACTED] CPA, [REDACTED] states that the petitioner began operating at the location of [REDACTED] Inc. because the book value of its assets was so low.

The facts of the precedent decision, *Matter of Dial Auto*, are instructive in this matter. *Matter of Dial Auto* involved a petition filed by Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc. on behalf of an alien beneficiary for the position of automotive technician. The beneficiary's former employer, Elvira Auto Body, filed the underlying labor certification. On the petition, Dial Auto claimed to be a successor-in-interest to Elvira Auto Body. The part of the Commissioner's decision relating to the successor-in-interest issue follows:

Additionally, the representations made by the petitioner concerning the relationship between Elvira Auto Body and itself are issues which have not been resolved. In order to determine whether the petitioner was a true successor to Elvira Auto Body, counsel was instructed on appeal to fully explain the manner by which the petitioner took over the business of Elvira Auto Body and to provide the Service with a copy of the contract or agreement between the two entities; however, no response was submitted. If the *petitioner's claim of having assumed all of Elvira Auto Body's rights, duties, obligations, etc.*, is found to be untrue, then grounds would exist for invalidation of the labor certification under 20 C.F.R. § 656.30 (1987). Conversely, if the claim is found to be true, and it is determined that an actual successorship exists, the petition could be approved if eligibility is otherwise shown, including ability of the predecessor enterprise to have paid the certified wage at the time of filing.

19 I&N Dec. at 482-3 (emphasis added).

The Commissioner's decision does not require a successor-in-interest to establish that it assumed all rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, in *Matter of Dial Auto*, the petitioner specifically represented that it had assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations, but failed to submit requested evidence to establish that this claim was, in fact, true. The Commissioner stated that if the petitioner's claim was untrue, the INS could invalidate the underlying labor certification for fraud or willful misrepresentation. For this reason the Commissioner said: "if the claim is found to be true, *and* it is determined that an actual successorship exists, the petition could be approved" *Id.* (emphasis added).

The Commissioner clearly considered the petitioner's claim that it had assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations to be a separate inquiry from whether or not the petitioner is a successor-in-interest. The Commissioner was most interested in receiving a full explanation as to the "manner by which the petitioner took over the business" and seeing a copy of "the contract or agreement between the two entities" in order to verify the petitioner's claims. *Id.*

Accordingly, *Matter of Dial Auto* does not stand for the proposition that a valid successor relationship may only be established through the assumption of "all" or a totality of a predecessor entity's rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, the generally accepted definition of a successor-in-interest is broader: "One who follows another in ownership or control of property. A successor in interest retains the same rights as the original owner, with no change in substance." *Black's Law Dictionary* 1570 (9th ed. 2009) (defining "successor in interest").

With respect to corporations, a successor is generally created when one corporation is vested with the rights and obligations of an earlier corporation through amalgamation, consolidation, or other assumption of interests.⁴ *Id.* at 1569 (defining “successor”). When considering other business organizations, such as partnerships or sole proprietorships, even a partial change in ownership may require the petitioner to establish that it is a true successor-in-interest to the employer identified in the labor certification application.⁵

The merger or consolidation of a business organization into another will give rise to a successor-in-interest relationship because the assets and obligations are transferred by operation of law. However, a mere transfer of assets, even one that takes up a predecessor’s business activities, does not necessarily create a successor-in-interest. *See Holland v. Williams Mountain Coal Co.*, 496 F.3d 670, 672 (D.C. Cir. 2007). An asset transaction occurs when one business organization sells property – such as real estate, machinery, or intellectual property - to another business organization. The purchase of assets from a predecessor will only result in a successor-in-interest relationship if the parties agree to the transfer and assumption of the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business.⁶ *See generally* 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2170 (2010).

Considering *Matter of Dial Auto* and the generally accepted definition of successor-in-interest, a petitioner may establish a valid successor relationship for immigration purposes if it satisfies three

⁴ Merger and acquisition transactions, in which the interests of two or more corporations become unified, may be arranged into four general groups. The first group includes “consolidations” that occur when two or more corporations are united to create one new corporation. The second group includes “mergers,” consisting of a transaction in which one of the constituent companies remains in being, absorbing the other constituent corporation. The third type of combination includes “reorganizations” that occur when the new corporation is the reincarnation or reorganization of one previously existing. The fourth group includes transactions in which a corporation, although continuing to exist as a “shell” legal entity, is in fact merged into another through the acquisition of its assets and business operations. 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2165 (2010).

⁵ For example, unlike a corporation with its own distinct legal identity, if a general partnership adds a partner after the filing of a labor certification application, a Form I-140 filed by what is essentially a new partnership must contain evidence that this partnership is a successor-in-interest to the filer of the labor certification application. *See Matter of United Investment Group*, 19 I&N Dec. 248 (Comm’r 1984). Similarly, as in the instant matter, if the employer identified in a labor certification application is a sole proprietorship, and the petitioner identified in the Form I-140 is a business organization, such as a corporation which happens to be solely owned by the individual who filed the labor certification application, the petitioner must nevertheless establish that it is a bona fide successor-in-interest.

⁶ The mere assumption of immigration obligations, or the transfer of immigration benefits derived from approved or pending immigration petitions or applications, will not give rise to a successor-in-interest relationship unless the transfer results from the bona fide acquisition of the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business. *See* 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2170; *see also* 20 C.F.R. § 656.12(a).

conditions. First, the petitioning successor must fully describe and document the transaction transferring ownership of all, or a relevant part of, the predecessor employer. Second, the petitioning successor must demonstrate that the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification. Third, the petitioning successor must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it is eligible for the immigrant visa in all respects.

Evidence of transfer of ownership must show that the successor not only purchased assets from the predecessor, but also the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business. To ensure that the job opportunity remains the same as originally certified, the successor must continue to operate the same type of business as the predecessor, in the same metropolitan statistical area and the essential business functions must remain substantially the same as before the ownership transfer. *See Matter of Dial Auto*, 19 I&N Dec. at 482.⁷

In order to establish eligibility for the immigrant visa in all respects, the petitioner must support its claim with all necessary evidence, including evidence of ability to pay. The petitioning successor must prove the predecessor's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and until the date of transfer of ownership to the successor. In addition, the petitioner must establish the successor's ability to pay the proffered wage from the date of transfer of ownership forward. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2); *see also Matter of Dial Auto*, 19 I&N Dec. at 482.

Applying the analysis set forth above to the instant petition, the petitioner has not established a valid successor-in-interest relationship for immigration purposes.⁸ In this case, it appears evident that the sole proprietor, [REDACTED] incorporated [REDACTED] in December of 2004 and was the sole owner of the new corporation. Counsel states that "all assets, liabilities, duties and obligations of the sole proprietorship were transferred to and assumed by the Petitioner." However, the petitioner has not documented the transaction transferring the assets, liabilities, duties and obligations of the sole proprietorship to the corporation. 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)). Further, the petitioner has not established that its purported predecessor had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date until the date of the purported transfer of assets, liabilities, duties and obligations to the petitioner on December 31, 2004.

⁷ It appears that the nature of the business and the nature of the proffered position remained the same.

⁸ 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).

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

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

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). 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 September 5, 2003. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$22,000 per year. The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience as a Japanese chef.

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, 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 or its predecessor employed and paid the beneficiary during that period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it or its predecessor 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, or that of its predecessor, to pay the proffered wage. In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it or its predecessor employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage continuously from the priority date.

If the petitioner does not establish that it or its predecessor 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).

In 2003 and 2004, the petitioner asserts that its predecessor operated as a sole proprietorship, a business in which one person operates the business in his or her personal capacity. Black's Law Dictionary 1398 (7th Ed. 1999). Unlike a corporation, a sole proprietorship does not exist as an entity apart from the individual owner. *See Matter of United Investment Group*, 19 I&N Dec. 248, 250 (Comm'r 1984). Therefore the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income, assets and personal liabilities are also considered as part of the predecessor's ability to pay. Sole proprietors report income and expenses from their businesses on their individual (Form 1040) federal tax return each year. The business-related income and expenses are reported on Schedule C and are carried forward to the first page of the tax return. Sole proprietors must show that they can cover their existing business expenses as well as pay the proffered wage out of their adjusted gross income or other available funds. In addition, sole proprietors must show that they can sustain themselves and their dependents. *See Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7th Cir. 1983).

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

In the instant case, the sole proprietor supported a family of three in 2003 and 2004. The proprietor's tax returns reflect that his adjusted gross income was \$132,894 (line 34) in 2003 and \$110,350 (line 36) in 2004. However, the record contains no evidence regarding the sole proprietor's household expenses or other financial obligations. Thus, it has not been established that the sole proprietor could support himself and his family on \$110,894 in 2003 and \$88,350 in 2004, which is what remains after reducing the proprietor's adjusted gross income by the amount required to pay the proffered wage. Therefore, the petitioner has not established that its purported predecessor had the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date to December 31, 2004.

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 submitted Forms 1120 for Heaven & Earth Group Inc. reflect net income of \$118,999 in 2005; \$170,559 in 2006; \$76,619 in 2007; and \$282,946 in 2008. Thus, the petitioner had sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage from 2005 through 2008.

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 did not establish the historical growth of the sole proprietorship since its establishment in 1994, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, its reputation within its industry, or whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service. It is also noted that according to USCIS records, the sole proprietorship has filed I-140 petitions on behalf of other beneficiaries. Accordingly, the petitioner must establish that the sole proprietorship 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 dates, 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, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that its purported predecessor had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage and that of all of the beneficiaries for which it has filed petitions.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.