



B6

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data deleted to
prevent identity unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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



File: EAC 01 086 52914 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: JUN 19 2002

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to § 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



PUBLIC COPY

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

Robert P. Wiemann
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 construction company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a mason. 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 October 27, 1997. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$22.96 per hour or \$47,756.80 per annum.

Counsel initially submitted insufficient evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. On August 6, 2001,

the director requested additional evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of October 27, 1997.

In response, counsel submitted a copy of the petitioner's unaudited financial statement for the period ended December 31, 1998 and copies of the petitioner's 1997 and 2000 Form 1120S U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation. The federal tax return for 1997 reflected gross receipts of \$873,742; gross profit of \$280,648; compensation of officers of \$30,480; salaries and wages paid of \$110,057; and an ordinary income (loss) from trade or business activities of \$21,598. The federal tax return for 2000 reflected gross receipts of \$578,063; gross profit of \$578,063; compensation of officers of \$0; salaries and wages paid of \$0; and an ordinary income (loss) from trade or business activities of \$11,705.

Counsel also submitted a letter from the petitioner's CPA which stated that Good View, Inc. and Good View Ent., Inc. are related companies.

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 argues that:

In 1997 the company should (sic) a net profit of \$41,206.00 including depreciation. A balance sheet for the period showed assets in excess of liabilities by \$8,614.00. For the year 2000 there was a net profit of \$39,766.00 including depreciation. For the period the balance sheet showed current assets of \$43,092.00. For both years the company had gross sales in excess of \$500,000.00. The company was established in 1993.

Counsel further argues that the beneficiary's employment will result in more income for the business. The petitioner does not explain, however, the basis for such a conclusion. For example, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary will replace less productive workers, transform the nature of the petitioner's operation, or increase the number of customers on the strength of his reputation. Absent evidence of these savings, this statement can only be taken as the accountant's personal opinion. Consequently, the Service is unable to take the potential earnings to be generated by the beneficiary's employment into consideration.

The petitioner's Form 1120S for the 1997 calendar year shows an ordinary income of \$21,598. The petitioner has not established its

ability to pay the proffered wage based upon its net income

.

In addition, the petitioner's Form 1120S for the 2000 calendar year continues to show an inability to pay the wage offered.

Accordingly, after a review of the federal tax return furnished, 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.

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.