

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE:



Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

SEP 24 2010

IN RE:

Petitioner:



Date:

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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must 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, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an excavation, masonry and concrete foundation company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a stone mason. 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).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 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 2, 2008 denial, the 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

¹ The applicant listed on the Form ETA 750 is [REDACTED]. The petitioner listed on the Form I-140 is [REDACTED]. This discrepancy will be addressed later in the decision.

by the DOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on May 6, 2002. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$18.27 per hour (\$38,001.60 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the proffered position.

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 evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner's alleged predecessor, [REDACTED], was structured as a C corporation in 2002 and that the instant petitioner, [REDACTED], was structured as an S corporation in 2003, 2004 and 2005. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 2003 and to have a gross annual income of [REDACTED] and a net annual income of \$[REDACTED]. The petitioner does not claim to currently employ any workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the Form ETA 750, signed by the beneficiary on April 30, 2002, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner's predecessor ([REDACTED]) from March of 2001 until the date the Form ETA 750 was signed.

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. Comm. 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. Comm. 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary during that period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. In the instant case, the petitioner has not established

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).

that it employed and paid the beneficiary any wages, or the full proffered wage during any relevant timeframe including the period from the priority date in 2002 or subsequently.

If the petitioner does not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage during that period, USCIS will next examine the net income figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. *River Street Donuts, LLC v. Napolitano*, 558 F.3d 111 (1st Cir. 2009); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, --- F. Supp. 2d. ---, 2010 WL 956001, at 6 (E.D. Mich. 2010). 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.

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 record before the director closed on July 30, 2007. As of that date, the petitioner’s 2006 federal income tax return would have been the most recent tax return available. The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate its net income as shown in the table below.

-
-
-
-
-

Therefore, for the years 2003 through 2006, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner claims to be the successor-in-interest to [REDACTED], the applicant named on the Form ETA 750, and the entity that submitted its 2002 tax return. The net income reported on the 2002 tax return is sufficient to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner has not, however, established that it is the successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]. *Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.* 19 I&N Dec. 481, 482 (Comm. 1981). *Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.* is an AAO decision designated as precedent by the Commissioner. *Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.* 19 I&N Dec. 481, 482 (Comm. 1981). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions are binding on all USCIS employees in the administration of the Act. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a).

³ 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.

⁴ 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 (2003) and line 17e (2004-2005) of Schedule K. See Instructions for Form 1120S, 2006, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholder’s shares of the corporation’s income, deductions, credits, etc.). Because the petitioner did not report additional income, credits, deductions or other adjustments shown on its Schedule K for any tax year, the petitioner’s net income is found on line 21 of page one of its tax returns. The 2004 and 2005 tax returns submitted are for Siteworks.

By way of background, *Matter of Dial Auto* involved a petition filed by Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc. (Dial Auto) on behalf of an alien beneficiary for the position of automotive technician. The beneficiary's former employer, [REDACTED] filed the underlying labor certification. On the petition, Dial Auto claimed to be a successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]. The part of the Commissioner's decision relating to successor-in-interest issue is set forth below:

Additionally, the *representations made by the petitioner* concerning the relationship between [REDACTED] and itself are issues which have not been resolved. On order to determine whether the petitioner was a true successor to [REDACTED] counsel was instructed on appeal to fully explain the manner by which the petitioner took over the business of [REDACTED] 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 [REDACTED] 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.

(All emphasis added). The legacy INS and USCIS has, at times, strictly interpreted *Matter of Dial Auto* to limit a successor-in-interest finding to cases where the petitioner could show that it assumed all of the original entity's rights, duties, obligations and assets. However, a close reading of the Commissioner's decision reveals that it does not explicitly require a successor-in-interest to establish that it is assuming all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, in *Matter of Dial Auto*, the petitioner had *represented* that it had assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations, but had failed to submit requested evidence to establish that this was, in fact, true. And, if the petitioner's claim was untrue, the Commissioner stated that the underlying *labor certification* could be *invalidated for fraud or willful misrepresentation* pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.30 (1987).⁵ This is why the Commissioner said "[i]f the petitioner's claim is found to be true,

⁵The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(d) (1987) states:

(d) After issuance labor certifications are subject to invalidation by the INS or by a Consul of the Department of State upon a determination, made in accordance with those agencies, procedures or by a Court, of fraud or willful misrepresentation of a material fact involving the labor certification application. If evidence of such fraud or willful misrepresentation becomes known to a Regional Administrator, Employment and Training Administration or to the Administrator, the Regional Administrator or Administrator, as appropriate, shall notify in writing the INS or State Department, as appropriate. A copy of the notification shall be sent to the regional or national office, as appropriate, of the Department of Labor's Office of Inspector General.

and it is determined that an actual successorship exists, the petition could be approved." (Emphasis added.) The Commissioner was explicitly stating that the petitioner's claim that it assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations is 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 of [the alleged predecessor] and seeing a copy of "the contract or agreement between the two entities."

In view of the above, *Matter of Dial Auto* did not state that a valid successor relationship could only be established through the assumption of all of a predecessor entity's rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, based on this precedent and the regulations pertaining to this visa classification, a valid successor relationship may be established if the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification; if the purported successor establishes eligibility in all respects, including the provision of evidence from the predecessor entity, such as evidence of the predecessor's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date; and if the petition fully describes and documents the transfer and assumption of the ownership of the predecessor by the claimed successor.

Evidence of transfer of ownership must show that the successor not only purchased the predecessor's assets but also that the successor acquired the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business in the same manner as the predecessor. The successor must continue to operate the same type of business as the predecessor, and the manner in which the business is controlled must remain substantially the same as it was before the ownership transfer. The successor must also establish its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from the date of business transfer until the beneficiary adjusts status to lawful permanent resident. The petitioner provided insufficient evidence to establish that it purchased the predecessor's assets and acquired the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor which is necessary to carry on the business in the same manner as the predecessor. The record does not establish that the business is controlled in substantially the same manner as it was before the alleged transfer. The only evidence presented in this regard is an unsworn statement from the petitioner's president, [REDACTED] stating that he previously owned [REDACTED]⁶ the applicant named on the labor certification application, and that he dissolved that corporation and is now the owner of [REDACTED]. He states that it "is the same entity except that the name has changed."

Regardless of any similarities in ownership between the petitioner and [REDACTED] the petitioner may not use the labor certification certified to [REDACTED]. The two entities are separate companies with separate employer identification numbers (EINs) and the petitioner has not established that it is the successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]. Despite [REDACTED]'s assertion that he simply changed the name of the business, a corporation is not required to obtain a new EIN if it simply changes its name. See <http://www.irs.gov/business/small/article/0,,id=98011,oo.html> (accessed September 9, 2010). [REDACTED].

⁶ A search of the New York Department of State, Division of Corporate Records (<http://www.dos.state.ny.us/>) website revealed no information about [REDACTED].

states that [REDACTED] is the same entity as [REDACTED] and that it wishes to continue sponsoring the beneficiary. The unsupported statement from the petitioner's president is insufficient to establish that [REDACTED] is the successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]. 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. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). It has not been established that Siteworks is the successor to United Building Corporation, that the tax returns for both entities can be used and that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date continuing onward.

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.⁷ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If the total of a corporation's end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets for 2003 through 2006, as shown in the table below.

- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of [REDACTED]
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of [REDACTED]
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of [REDACTED]
- The petitioner did not submit its tax returns for 2006.

Therefore, for the years 2002 through 2006, the petitioner has not established that it had 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 states that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onward. In support of that assertion counsel submits copies of the petitioner's bank statements from 2005 through 2008. Reliance on the balances in the petitioner's bank accounts is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R.

⁷According 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.

§ 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 returns, 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. It is noted that the petitioner's bank statement for August of 2007 refers to the petitioner as a "[REDACTED]" which indicates that the petitioner had filed for bankruptcy.

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 (BIA 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 Form I-140 petitioner's tax returns indicate that it had insufficient net current assets or net income to pay the proffered wage during any relevant year. The petitioner did not provide its tax return for 2006. The tax returns provided show no officer compensation or salaries or wages paid in any relevant year, and show costs of labor of [REDACTED]. The petitioner's gross receipts were substantially inconsistent, [REDACTED] 2004 and 2005, respectively. The record does not establish that the petitioner's reputation in the industry is such that it is more likely than not that the petitioner maintains the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner also appears to have declared bankruptcy in 2007. 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.

Beyond the decision of the director, it should be noted that the record contains conflicting information about the beneficiary's past employment and, therefore, the petitioner has not sufficiently established that the beneficiary meets the experience requirements of the position. Form ETA 750 requires two years of experience as a stone mason. 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*, 299 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003). The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have the education and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's filing date, which as noted above, is May 6, 2002. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii) specifies for the classification of a skilled worker that:

(B) *Skilled workers*. If the petition is for a skilled worker, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification, meets the requirements for Schedule A designation, or meets the requirements for the Labor Market Information Pilot Program occupation designation. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

The Form ETA 750, which was signed by the beneficiary under penalty of perjury, states that the beneficiary was employed by [REDACTED] Contracting from February of 1999 until March of 2001 as a stone mason, and for [REDACTED] as a stone mason from March 2001 till the date of signature (April 30, 2002). An employment verification letter provided by [REDACTED], states that the beneficiary was employed by him as a stone mason from February of 1999 until March of 2003. This discrepancy is material to the claim as it has a direct bearing on the beneficiary's past employment and the experience that he received. It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988). Consequently, given the discrepancy, we cannot adequately conclude that the petitioner established that the beneficiary has the two years of experience required in the position offered.

The evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.