



Blo

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
[Redacted]

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

File: EAC 00 279 52740

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: 02 JUN 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

[Redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other Worker Pursuant to § 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii).

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[Redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which 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 which 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 which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Helen E Crawford
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cook. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification approved by the Department of Labor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the financial ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the filing date of the visa petition.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional evidence.

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 or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

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.

Eligibility in this matter hinges on the petitioner's ability to pay the wage offered as of the petition's filing date, which is the date the request for labor certification was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor. Matter of Wing's Tea House, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the petition's filing date is July 22, 1999. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$17.43 per hour or \$36,254.40 per annum.

The petitioner initially submitted an incomplete petition.

The director concluded that the evidence submitted did not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the filing date of the petition. On May 30, 2001, the director requested additional evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of July 22, 1999, to include the petitioner's 1999 and 2000 federal tax returns.

In response, counsel submitted copies of the first page of the petitioner's 1999 and 2000 Form 1120S U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation. The 1999 federal tax return reflected gross receipts of \$97,251; gross profit of \$72,718; compensation of officers of \$0; salaries and wages paid of \$9,600; and an ordinary income (loss) from trade or business activities of \$17,074. The 2000 federal tax return reflected gross receipts of \$135,962; gross profit of \$98,804; compensation of officers of \$0; salaries and wages paid of \$23,000; and an ordinary income (loss) from trade or business activities of \$36,915.

On July 18, 2001, the director again requested evidence to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the wage offered in 1999. The director further noted that the petitioner requested classification of the beneficiary as a skilled worker, however, the job offered required no experience, no training, and no education. The director requested that the petitioner decide whether it wanted to change the classification to that of "other worker."

In response, counsel requested the classification be changed to that of other worker. Regarding the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the filing date of the petition, counsel stated:

The Beneficiary is not working in the company i.e. restaurant therefore the paying of the salary in 1999 does not arise, the Beneficiary is going to work as and when the Service is going to approve the petition. As you mentioned in your quarry (sic) that the Petitioner can afford to pay the salary of \$36,244 as soon as the petition is approved and the Beneficiary is authorized to work. Therefore we feel there is no reason to file any additional evidence.

The director determined that the evidence did not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel submits a copy of the petitioner's deed to his house and evidence of a certificate of deposit for the petitioner with a maturity date of August 5, 2001, with a maturity value of

\$14,353.81.

The petitioning entity in this case, however, is a corporation. Consequently, any assets of the individual stockholders including ownership of shares in other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. See Matter of M, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958; AG 1958); Matter of Aphrodite Investments Limited, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980); and Matter of Tessel, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980).

The petitioner's Form 1120S for the calendar year 1999 shows an ordinary income of \$17,074.00. The petitioner could not pay a salary of \$36,254.40 per year from this figure.

The petitioner must show that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Based on the evidence submitted, it cannot be found that the petitioner had sufficient funds available to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage at the time of filing the application for alien employment certification as required by 8 C.F.R. 204.5(g)(2). Therefore, the petition may not be approved.

Accordingly, after a review of the federal tax returns, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had sufficient available funds to pay the salary offered at the time of filing of the petition and continuing to present.

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.