U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 40254481

Date: MAR. 4, 2026

Appeal of Field Operations Directorate Decision

Form I-526, Immigrant Petition by Alien Entrepreneur

The Petitioner seeks classification as an immigrant investor pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) Section 203(b)(5), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(5) (2021).[1] This fifth preference (EB-5) classification makes immigrant visas available to aliens who invest the requisite amount of qualifying capital in a new commercial enterprise that will benefit the United States economy and create at least 10 full-time positions for qualifying employees.

Field Operations Directorate (FOD) denied the petition, concluding that the record did not establish that: 1) the Petitioner invested in a new commercial enterprise (NCE) that is conducting lawful business, 2) the required capital was and remained at risk and available to the job creating entities, and 3) the requisite job creation would ensue from the investment. The matter is now before us on appeal pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). We review the questions in this matter de novo. *Matter of Christo's, Inc.*, 26 I&N Dec. 537, 537 n.2 (AAO 2015). Upon de novo review, we will withdraw the decision and remand the matter for entry of a new decision consistent with the following analysis.

I. LAW

Alien investors are eligible for immigrant classification if they invest or are actively in the process of investing the requisite amount of capital in a new commercial enterprise which will benefit the United States economy and create full-time employment for at least 10 United States citizens, lawful permanent residents, or other immigrants authorized to work in the United States. Section 203(b)(5)(A) of the Act (2019); 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j). An alien may invest the required funds directly in an NCE or through a regional center, as the Petitioner has done in this case. A regional center is an economic unit involved with the promotion of economic growth. 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(e). For NCEs

[1] On March 15, 2022, the EB-5 Reform and Integrity Act of 2022 was signed into law, revising general eligibility requirements, substantially reforming and codifying the Regional Center Program in Section 203(b)(5) of the Act, and adding significant new integrity provisions. *See* Section 203(b)(5) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(5) (2022). As the Petitioner filed her petition in 2019, the relevant law then in existence governs this appellate adjudication.

located in a targeted employment area (TEA), aliens must invest at least $500,000 of capital. Section 203(b)(5)(C)(ii) of the Act (2019).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(2) provides that the alien investor must establish that they have invested or are actively in the process of investing the required amount of capital and must submit evidence verifying that they have placed the required amount of capital at risk for the purpose of generating a return on the capital placed at risk. The precedent decision, *Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 179 (Assoc. Comm'r 1998), explains that for an investor to establish that they have placed their investment funds at risk for the purpose of generating a return, the full amount of EB-5 money must be made available to the business(es) most closely responsible for creating the employment upon which the petition is based.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(4)(i) provides that to establish job creation, a petitioner must submit either documentation of relevant records of ten qualifying employees, 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.[2]

To be "comprehensive," a business plan "must be sufficiently detailed to permit [USCIS] to draw reasonable inferences about the job-creation potential." *Matter of Ho,* 22 I&N Dec. 206, 213 (Assoc. Comm'r 1998). "Mere conclusory assertions[, however,] do not enable [USCIS] to determine whether the job-creation projections are any more reliable than hopeful speculation." *Id.* The decision concludes: "Most importantly, the business plan must be credible." *Id.*

II. ANALYSIS

The Petitioner claimed that she invested $500,000 on October 16, 2019, into the NCE, [redacted] associated with [redacted] The business plan states that the project, located in a TEA, is a $30 million venture intended to raise up to $20 million from 40 EB-5 immigrant investors to be lent to the job creating entities (JCEs): [redacted] The plan indicates that the project will be managed by [redacted]. The business plan states the project will involve expansion of vehicle fleets servicing disabled individuals, establishment and operation of a driver's academy, a maintenance and repair facility, a parking facility, routing software and an accessible transportation application (app). The business plan and an economic impact analysis state the project will create a total of 1,079 jobs as a result of the EB-5 investment.

[2] The two-year job creation period described in 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(4)(i)(B) commences six months after the adjudication of the petition. 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* G.2(D)(5), https://www.uscis.gov/policy-manual/volume-6-part-g-chapter-2; *see also* USCIS Policy Memorandum PM-602-0083, *EB-5 Adjudications Policy* 19 (May 30, 2013), https://www.uscis.gov/legal-resources/policy-memoranda.

A. New Commercial Enterprise and Capital at Risk

FOD determined the Petitioner did not establish that the NCE was exclusively participating in lawful business, as the definition of commercial enterprise at 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(e) requires. FOD also concluded that the Petitioner did not establish that the invested capital remained with the JCEs. However, instead of addressing the various deficiencies under the applicable regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(1) and (2), FOD denied the petition relying on public lawsuits and legal actions against various actors associated with or surrounding [redacted] without addressing their relationships to the NCE and relevance to the eligibility criteria. In the denial, FOD listed a series of pending lawsuits without incorporating them into the record.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(ii), "a determination of statutory ineligibility shall be based only on information contained in the record of proceeding" which is disclosed to the petitioner. To ensure fair and complete consideration of the proceedings before us, it is necessary that the record of proceedings contains copies of all evidence considered. FOD bears the responsibility of ensuring that the record is complete and contains all evidence submitted by the Petitioner and any other evidence considered by FOD in reaching the decision. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1); *cf. Matter of Gibson*, 16 I&N Dec. 58, 59 (BIA 1976) (explaining the District Director is primarily responsible for ensuring the completeness of the record reviewed on appeal). Here, the record lacks copies of any open-source materials FOD may have reviewed. As a result, the Petitioner did not have a meaningful opportunity to address the derogatory information.

Additionally, FOD discussed the class action lawsuit by former drivers of [redacted] as well as complaints filed by the New York Supreme Court and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) against [redacted] alleging fraud and other illegal activities such as misappropriation of investment from the NCE. However, there is no indication that these cases have been resolved by the courts and the litigation is ongoing. In response to FOD's notice of intent to deny (NOID) and on appeal, the Petitioner submits the defendants' motions to dismiss these complaints and argues that complaints are not the final court findings of illegal or criminal activities. We do not give substantial weight to arrest reports, criminal complaints, and charging documents that did not lead to a conviction. *Matter of Arreguin De Rodriguez*, 21 I&N Dec. 38, 42 (BIA 1995).

Upon de novo review, we share similar concerns with FOD over the activities of the NCE and its management and the use of EB-5 capital. However, because FOD did not clearly articulate the relevant facts and link them to eligibility, it did not allow us an opportunity for meaningful appellate review. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(i); *see also Matter of M-P-*, 20 I&N Dec. 786 (BIA 1994) (finding that a decision must fully explain the reasons for denying a motion to allow the respondent a meaningful opportunity to challenge the determination on appeal).

Therefore, we remand the matter so that FOD can review the evidence based on 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(2) and *Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. at 179, to determine whether the Petitioner made her funds available to the business most closely responsible for job creation in this pooled investment case. If FOD questions whether the Petitioner irrevocably committed funds to the NCE, issuance of a request for evidence may be appropriate to provide the Petitioner with a reasonable opportunity to respond.

FOD should also identify and incorporate any publicly sourced documents into the record before issuing a new decision.

B. Job Creation

FOD also determined the Petitioner did not establish the requisite job creation. FOD issued a NOID for evidence of the credibility of the business plan. In response, the Petitioner submitted a document entitled "Appendix: Business Changes to the Project." The Appendix states that of the projected 40 EB-5 investors, only 14 EB-5 investors were obtained and the projected $10 million in additional equity was not obtained; of the original 200 vehicle expansion, only 12 vehicles were purchased; the driver's academy was built, but later closed; the software was developed, but not used; the app was eliminated; and the maintenance and repair facility was upgraded from five-bays to 12-bays.

The Appendix states the headquarters of the project at [redacted] were let go and moved to the maintenance and repair facility at [redacted] In response to the NOID, the Petitioner also submitted a July 23, 2023 sublease of this [redacted] Street location to [redacted]. The Petitioner does not indicate that [redacted] is affiliated with the NCE, JCEs, or the manager of the project.

The Appendix also asserts "[n]umerous jobs were created for drivers, repair technicians and the associated personnel required in support of the larger fleets, technology, facilities management and administrative support." However, the Petitioner does not state how many jobs were created and did not submit revised projections of the number of jobs that will be created in the future given the downsizing of the project.

In response to the NOID, the Petitioner also submitted an affidavit from T-G-, former Chief Legal and Compliance Officer with [redacted], the manager of the project. T-G- explains that since the initial raise of EB-5 capital in 2019, "several major global, industry, and program disruptions and changes took place altering the capital raise and scalability as intended for the project." As a result of the COVID-19 crisis, macroeconomic uncertainty, and Securities and Exchange Commission and Department of Justice regulatory actions in 2023, T-G- states only 14 EB-5 investors were subscribed, the capital raise and equity investment were halted, major business contracts were lost, and the manager's "revenue reduced nearly to zero." Although the project was downscaled, T-G- states the project evolved and "a portion of the business plan" was executed.

FOD determined the business plan was not comprehensive and credible because it did not establish the requisite job creation, the business activities were not clear and supported with evidence, the record contained inconsistencies about site status, entity operating status, and there was a lack of evidence regarding vehicle operation, and the flow of invested funds. On appeal, the Petitioner asserts she submitted sufficient evidence of business activity and the project, while downsized, is operational. The record does not establish that the limited amount of business activity is consistent with the business plan's description of the project such that the business plan remains credible.

First, the record does not establish that sufficient capital will be obtained to finance the project. The business plan sought up to $20 million from 40 EB-5 investors, but the evidence shows just 14 EB-5

investors subscribed and contributed only $7 million in capital. In addition, T-G- confirms the $10 million in additional equity originally included in the capital stack was not obtained. On appeal, the Petitioner asserts that "the developers were able to implement a revised business plan that would inject capital where it would be needed the most, while still preserving the Project's growth trajectory and capacity to expand." The record does not support this assertion. The Petitioner did not submit a revised business plan or other evidence that the project's growth and capacity to expand have been preserved.

Second, the record shows the project's business has been greatly reduced from that described in the business plan. From a $30 million project consisting of a 200-vehicle fleet expansion, a maintenance and repair facility, a driver's academy, a parking facility, routing software, and an accessible transportation app, the record indicates that only 12 vehicles were purchased. On appeal, the Petitioner asserts that evidence of expenditures for vehicle purchases, furniture and fixtures, rent and utilities, and other general costs show that business is being conducted "in furtherance of the Project as constituted." However, the record shows the driver's academy closed, the software was not used, and the app was eliminated. The Petitioner did not submit evidence that the parking facility has been maintained and the sublease indicates that the location of the maintenance and repair facility has been subleased to another business that is not associated with the project.

Contrary to the Petitioner's assertions on appeal, the record does not establish that sufficient capital has or will be obtained to finance the project as described in the business plan and the evidence shows the scope of the project has been greatly reduced. Although the Appendix explained how the project was downscaled, it did not demonstrate that the project has the capacity to develop in the future as described in the business plan. Consequently, the business plan lacks credibility and the Petitioner has not established that the NCE, the JCEs, or the manager of the project will likely create at least 10 jobs for each investor seeking EB-5 classification, within two years, as projected in the business plan and economic analysis. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(4)(i)(B); *Matter of Ho*, 22 I&N Dec. at 213.

However, in determining that the Petitioner did not submit a comprehensive business plan establishing the requisite potential for job creation, FOD relied upon its prior conclusion that the NCE was not engaging in lawful business. As FOD's conclusion relied upon complaints in pending litigation, we remand this issue so that FOD can review the evidence based on 8 C.F.R. § 204.6(j)(4) and *Matter of Ho*, 22 I&N Dec. at 213, to determine whether the Petitioner has established the requisite job creation.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed, FOD's decision is withdrawn. On remand, FOD may issue a new request for evidence or notice of intent to deny allowing the Petitioner an opportunity to provide additional evidence relevant to the issues discussed above, and any other evidence deemed necessary to demonstrate eligibility for the classification sought, before issuing a new decision.

ORDER: The decision is withdrawn. The matter is remanded for the entry of a new decision consistent with the foregoing analysis.