




BC

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifies...  
prevent clearly warranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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



JAN 14 2003

File: EAC 01 126 51257 Office: Vermont Service Center


Date:

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 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.

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 restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a specialty chef. 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 priority 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 priority 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 priority date is January 12, 1998. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$400.40 per week or \$20,820.80 per annum.

Counsel initially submitted copies of the petitioner's 1997, 1998, and 1999 1120 U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The tax return

for fiscal year from May 1, 1998 through April 30, 1999 reflected gross receipts of \$278,557; gross profit of \$163,178; compensation of officers of \$8,030; salaries and wages paid of \$39,254; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of \$6,282. The tax return for fiscal year from May 1, 1999 through April 30, 2000 reflected gross receipts of \$266,423; gross profit of \$157,814; compensation of officers of \$6,050; salaries and wages paid of \$42,743; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of \$2,079.

On August 14, 2001, the director requested additional evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage.

In response, counsel submitted a letter from the petitioner's CPA which stated, in pertinent part:

The availability of funds is based upon depreciation, tax and projected gross revenue increases of 10-12%. In addition to taxable income of \$2,079.00 reflected in the 1999 taxes, depreciation amortization of \$5,173 is available. The liquidity of \$7,252 in 1999 in addition to projected gross receipt increases will exceed \$21,000.

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, the Service will examine the net income figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. Reliance on federal income tax returns as a basis for determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is well-established by both Service and judicial precedent. Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava, 632 F.Supp. 1049, 1054 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) (citing Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman, 736 F.2d 1305 (9th Cir. 1984); see also Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh, 719 F.Supp. 532 (N.D. Texas 1989); K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava, 623 F.Supp. 1080 (S.D.N.Y. 1985); Ubeda v. Palmer, 539 F.Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), aff'd, 703 F.2d 571 (7th Cir. 1983). In K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava, the court held the Service had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns, rather than the petitioner's gross income. 623 F. Supp. at 1084. The court specifically rejected the argument that the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. Finally, there is no precedent that would allow the petitioner to "add back to net cash the depreciation expense charged for the year." Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh, 719 F.Supp. at 537; see also Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava, 632 F.Supp. at 1054.

The CPA further argues that the beneficiary's employment will result in more income for the business. The CPA does not explain, however, the basis for such a conclusion. For example, the CPA 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 CPA's personal opinion. Consequently, the Service is unable to take the potential earnings to be generated by the beneficiary's employment into consideration.

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

On appeal, counsel argues that "the Center Director erred using the \$400.40 per week figure as the proffered wage that the employer had to meet in 1998 when the employer only offered \$250 per week then and the \$400.40 figure did not come into play until August 2000."

Counsel's argument is not persuasive. The petitioner's Form 1120 for fiscal year from May 1, 1998 through April 30, 1999 shows a taxable income of \$6,282. The petitioner could not pay a proffered wage of \$20,820.80 a year out of this income.

The petitioner must show that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date of the petition and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent resident status. See 8 C.F.R. 204.5(g)(2).

Accordingly, after a review of the federal tax returns submitted, 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.