U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

B7

PUBLIC COPY

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

[redacted]

FEB 25 2003

File: [redacted] Office: California Service Center Date:

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition by Alien Entrepreneur Pursuant to Section 203(b)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(5)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

INSTRUCTIONS:
This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Elizabeth Hayward

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner seeks classification as an alien entrepreneur pursuant to section 203(b)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(5).

The director determined that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate that he had made a qualifying, at-risk investment of lawfully obtained funds or that he would create the requisite employment.

The director also questioned whether the petitioner had personally established a new commercial enterprise. The 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act, Pub. L. No. 107-273 116 Stat. 1758 (2002), which amends portions of the statutory framework of the EB-5 Alien Entrepreneur program, was signed into law on November 2, 2002. Section 11036(a)(1)(B) of this law eliminates the requirement that the alien personally establish the new commercial enterprise. Section 11036(c) provides that the amendment shall apply to aliens having a pending petition. As the petitioner's appeal was pending on November 2, 2002, he need not demonstrate that he personally established a new commercial enterprise. The issue of whether the petitioner purchased a preexisting business is still relevant, however, as a petitioner must still demonstrate the creation of 10 new jobs.

On appeal, counsel argued that the Patriot Act has delayed the petitioner's ability to transfer a large sum of capital into the United States and requested an additional 60 days in which to supplement the record. As of this date, more than four months later, the AAO has received nothing further. The appeal will be adjudicated on the evidence of record.

Section 203(b)(5)(A) of the Act, as amended, provides classification to qualified immigrants seeking to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in a new commercial enterprise:

> (i) in which such alien has invested (after the date of the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1990) or, is actively in the process of investing, capital in an amount not less than the amount specified in subparagraph (C), and
>
> (ii) which will benefit the United States economy and create full-time employment for not fewer than 10 United States citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence or other immigrants lawfully authorized to be employed in the United States (other than the immigrant and the immigrant's spouse, sons, or daughters).

The record indicates that the petition is based on an investment in a business, Bluetooth Product Center, Inc., not located in a targeted employment area for which the required amount of capital invested has been adjusted downward. Thus, the required amount of capital in this case is $1,000,000.

INVESTMENT OF CAPITAL

On the petition, the petitioner indicated that he had "committed" $1,000,000. In support of the petition, the petitioner submitted a business plan that provides, under the "capitalization" section, "[the petitioner], the Company's sole shareholder has committed the sum of USD One Million ($1,000,000) to carry out the first phase of its business plan."

8 C.F.R. § 204.6(e) states, in pertinent part, that:

> *Capital* means cash, equipment, inventory, other tangible property, cash equivalents, and indebtedness secured by assets owned by the alien entrepreneur, provided the alien entrepreneur is personally and primarily liable and that the assets of the new commercial enterprise upon which the petition is based are not used to secure any of the indebtedness.
>
> * * *
>
> *Invest* means to contribute capital. A contribution of capital in exchange for a note, bond, convertible debt, obligation, or any other debt arrangement between the alien entrepreneur and the new commercial enterprise does not constitute a contribution of capital for the purposes of this part.

8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j) states, in pertinent part, that:

> (2) To show that the petitioner has invested or is actively in the process of investing the required amount of capital, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the petitioner has placed the required amount of capital at risk for the purpose of generating a return on the capital placed at risk. *Evidence of mere intent to invest, or of prospective investment arrangements entailing no present commitment, will not suffice to show that the petitioner is actively in the process of investing. The alien must show actual commitment of the required amount of capital.*

(Emphasis added.) On April 29, 2002, the director requested additional evidence of the petitioner's "commitment," noting that *Matter of Hsiung*, 22 I&N Dec. 201, 203 (Comm. 1998) held that any promise to pay the new commercial enterprise must be secured by the assets of the petitioner.

The director further advised the petitioner that 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(2) also provides that the petitioner must submit the following:

> (i) Bank statement(s) showing amount(s) deposited in United States business account(s) for the enterprise;

(ii) Evidence of assets which have been purchased for use in the United States enterprise, including invoices, sales receipts, and purchase contracts containing sufficient information to identify such assets, their purchase costs, date of purchase, and purchasing entity;

(iii) Evidence of property transferred from abroad for use in the United States enterprise, including United States Customs Service commercial entry documents, bills of lading and transit insurance policies containing ownership information and sufficient information to identify the property and to indicate the fair market value of such property;

(iv) Evidence of monies transferred or committed to be transferred to the new commercial enterprise in exchange for shares of stock (voting or nonvoting, common or preferred). Such stock may not include terms requiring the new commercial enterprise to redeem it at the holder's request; or

(v) Evidence of any loan or mortgage agreement, promissory note, security agreement, or other evidence of borrowing which is secured by assets of the petitioner, other than those of the new commercial enterprise, and for which the petitioner is personally and primarily liable.

In response, the petitioner requested additional time in which to respond. The director cited 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(8) for the proposition that a petitioner may not request additional time in which to respond and concluded that, given the lack of transactional documentation, the petitioner had not demonstrated a qualifying investment.

On appeal, counsel asserted that the Patriot Act, passed after September 11, 2001, has caused the delay in the petitioner's investment. The petitioner did not submit evidence of a personal account containing $1,000,000 awaiting transfer. As stated above, counsel requested an additional 60 days in which to supplement the record but the petitioner failed to submit additional documentation. Even if the petitioner were able to demonstrate that he has now finally transferred his funds to the new commercial enterprise, assuming it exists, he would still not be able to demonstrate his eligibility as of the date of filing. A petition cannot be approved at a future date after the petitioner becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *See Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm. 1971).

Moreover, the petitioner would need to demonstrate that those funds were not only fully committed to the new commercial enterprise, but also at risk. *Matter of Ho*, 22 I&N Dec. 206 (Comm. 1998), states:

> Simply formulating an idea for future business activity, without taking meaningful concrete action, is similarly insufficient for a petitioner to meet the at-risk requirement. Before it can be said that capital made available to a commercial enterprise has been placed at risk, a petitioner must present some evidence of the actual undertaking of

> business activity; otherwise, no assurance exists that the funds will in fact be used to carry out the business of the commercial enterprise. This petitioner's de minimus action of signing a lease agreement, without more, is not enough.

Id. at 210. Review of the record reveals that the petition was not initially supported with any documentation of business activity. Thus, even if the petitioner were to eventually finance the company and commence business activity, the instant petition was filed prematurely.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j) states, in pertinent part, that:

> (3) To show that the petitioner has invested, or is actively in the process of investing, capital obtained through lawful means, the petition must be accompanied, as applicable, by:
>
> (i) Foreign business registration records;
>
> (ii) Corporate, partnership (or any other entity in any form which has filed in any country or subdivision thereof any return described in this subpart), and personal tax returns including income, franchise, property (whether real, personal, or intangible), or any other tax returns of any kind filed within five years, with any taxing jurisdiction in or outside the United States by or on behalf of the petitioner;
>
> (iii) Evidence identifying any other source(s) of capital; or
>
> (iv) Certified copies of any judgments or evidence of all pending governmental civil or criminal actions, governmental administrative proceedings, and any private civil actions (pending or otherwise) involving monetary judgments against the petitioner from any court in or outside the United States within the past fifteen years.

A petitioner cannot establish the lawful source of funds merely by submitting bank letters or statements documenting the deposit of funds. *Matter of Ho*, 22 I&N Dec. 201, 210-211 (Comm. 1998); *Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 195 (Comm. 1998). Without documentation of the path of the funds, the petitioner cannot meet his burden of establishing that the funds are his own funds. *Id.* Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). These "hypertechnical" requirements serve a valid government interest: confirming that the funds utilized are not of suspect origin. *Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, CIV-F-99-6117, 22 (E.D. Calif. 2001)(affirming a finding that a petitioner had failed to establish the lawful source of her funds due to her failure to designate the nature of all of her employment or submit five years of tax returns).

The record contains no explanation for the petitioner's alleged accumulation of wealth. On appeal, counsel refers to an expected capital contribution of $5,000,000 from International Joint Venture Partner. The record contains no evidence regarding this entity. Nevertheless, capital invested by a corporation, even if the petitioner is the sole shareholder, cannot be considered the petitioner's personal investment as a corporation is a separate legal entity. *See Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980); *Matter of Aphrodite Investments Limited*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980); *Matter of M-*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958; A.G. 1958).

EMPLOYMENT CREATION

8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(4)(i) states:

> To show that a new commercial enterprise will create not fewer than ten (10) full-time positions for qualifying employees, the petition must be accompanied by:
>
> (A) Documentation consisting of photocopies of relevant tax records, Form I-9, or other similar documents for ten (10) qualifying employees, if such employees have already been hired following the establishment of the new commercial enterprise; or
>
> (B) A copy of a comprehensive business plan showing that, due to the nature and projected size of the new commercial enterprise, the need for not fewer than ten (10) qualifying employees will result, including approximate dates, within the next two years, and when such employees will be hired.

8 C.F.R. § 204.6(e) states, in pertinent part:

> *Full-time employment* means employment of a qualifying employee by the new commercial enterprise in a position that requires a minimum of 35 working hours per week.
>
> * * *
>
> *Qualifying employee* means a United States citizen, a lawfully admitted permanent resident, or other immigrant lawfully authorized to be employed in the United States including, but not limited to, a conditional resident, a temporary resident, an asylee, a refugee, or an alien remaining in the United States under suspension of deportation. This definition does not include the alien entrepreneur, the alien entrepreneur's spouse, sons, or daughters, or any nonimmigrant alien.

Full-time employment means continuous, permanent employment. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, CIV-F-99-6117, 19 (E.D. Calif. 2001)(finding this construction not to be an abuse of discretion).

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(4)(i)(B), if the employment-creation requirement has not been satisfied prior to filing the petition, the petitioner must submit a "comprehensive business plan" which demonstrates that "due to the nature and projected size of the new commercial enterprise, the need for not fewer than ten (10) qualifying employees will result, including approximate dates, within the next two years, and when such employees will be hired." To be considered comprehensive, a business plan must be sufficiently detailed to permit the Service to reasonably conclude that the enterprise has the potential to meet the job-creation requirements.

A comprehensive business plan as contemplated by the regulations should contain, at a minimum, a description of the business, its products and/or services, and its objectives. *Matter of Ho, supra*. Elaborating on the contents of an acceptable business plan, *Matter of Ho* states the following:

> The plan should contain a market analysis, including the names of competing businesses and their relative strengths and weaknesses, a comparison of the competition's products and pricing structures, and a description of the target market/prospective customers of the new commercial enterprise. The plan should list the required permits and licenses obtained. If applicable, it should describe the manufacturing or production process, the materials required, and the supply sources. The plan should detail any contracts executed for the supply of materials and/or the distribution of products. It should discuss the marketing strategy of the business, including pricing, advertising, and servicing. The plan should set forth the business's organizational structure and its personnel's experience. It should explain the business's staffing requirements and contain a timetable for hiring, as well as job descriptions for all positions. It should contain sales, cost, and income projections and detail the bases therefor. Most importantly, the business plan must be credible.

Id. at 213. In his request for additional documentation and in his final notice, the director advised the petitioner that he had not submitted a business plan that meets the requirements quoted above. The petitioner's business plan is not supported by the licensing contracts referenced in the plan and does not explain the company's staffing requirements or contain a timetable for hiring or job descriptions. Thus, we concur with the director. The petitioner did not submit a revised plan in response to the director's request for additional documentation. On appeal, counsel claims that the new business will create "hundreds if not thousands of new jobs for U.S. computer and telecommunication experts who have recently been laid off due to the economic downturn in the high tech industries." This claim is unsupported by a business plan that meets the requirements quoted above. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

For all of the reasons set forth above, considered in sum and as alternative grounds for denial, this petition cannot be approved.

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.