



BC

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identification data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwanted  
invasion of personal privacy

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



File: LIN 01 172 54401

Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: MAY 06 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



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, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a wholesale, resale, mail order, computer sales and services company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a computer applications marketing representative. 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 November 29, 1999. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$56,000.00 per annum.

Counsel initially submitted copies of the petitioner's 1998, 1999, and 2000 Form 1120S U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation. The 1999 federal tax return reflected gross receipts of \$666,291; gross profit of \$169,306; compensation of officers of \$20,800; salaries and wages paid of \$81,726; and an ordinary income (loss) from trade or business activities of -\$59,753. The 2000 federal tax return reflected gross receipts of \$417,438; gross profit of \$111,804; compensation of officers of \$14,400; salaries and wages paid of \$56,422; and an ordinary income (loss) from trade or business activities of -\$47,074.

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 August 29, 2001, the director requested additional evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage.

In response, counsel submitted copies of the owner of the petitioning entity's 1999 and 2000 Form 1040 U.S. Individual Income Tax Return, a copy of an investment document for the owner of the petitioning entity, and checking account statements for the petitioner for the period from November 30, 1999 through July 31, 2001.

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

On appeal, counsel reiterates his argument that:

While it is correct that a corporation is a distinct legal entity, it does not follow that upon incorporation financial integration between owners/shareholders and the corporate entity ceases. Under Ohio law, activities of shareholders that affect the viability of the corporation are strictly regulated. The infusion of capital by owners and shareholders into a corporation to meet ongoing financial obligations protects the viability of the company as such is not statutorily prohibited. By way of contrast, Ohio law **does** prohibit cash flowing **out** of the corporation to a shareholder under certain circumstances, as this may negatively impact the entity's viability.

Counsel's argument is not persuasive. The Service is not bound by Ohio law.

The petitioner's Form 1120S for the calendar year 1999 shows an

ordinary income of -\$59,753 and current assets of -\$36,351. The petitioner could not pay a proffered wage of \$56,000 per year out of a negative income or negative net assets. Therefore, the petitioner has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage based upon its net income or its net assets.

In addition, the 2000 federal tax return continues to show an inability to pay the proffered wage.

Accordingly, after a review of the federal tax returns 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 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.