

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

B10
Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
425 Eye Street N.W.
BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
Washington, D.C. 20536

JUN 05 2003

File: WAC 01 217 51700 Office: California Service Center Date:

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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

PUBLIC COPY

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER: SELF-REPRESENTED

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 Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) 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.

Selen E. Crawford for
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an executive 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, the petitioner submits a brief.

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 July 13, 1999. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$20.15 per hour or \$41,912.00 per annum.

The petitioner submitted copies of its 1998 through 2001 Form 1120 U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The tax return for 1999

reflected gross receipts of \$641,347; gross profit of \$399,628; compensation of officers of \$10,000; salaries and wages paid of \$0; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of -\$916. The federal tax return for 2000 reflected gross receipts of \$584,721; gross profit of \$413,704; compensation of officers of \$5,300; salaries and wages paid of \$40,229; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of -\$3,270.

The federal tax return for 2001 reflected gross receipts of \$561,798; gross profit of \$360,811; compensation of officers of \$500; salaries and wages paid of \$0; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of \$7,865.

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, the petitioner argues that in 1999, 2000, and 2001, the petitioner "had to hire outside contract services of \$106,201.00."

The petitioner's assertion that the funds paid to outside contractors could be used to pay the beneficiary's salary is not persuasive. These funds were not retained by the petitioner for future use. Instead, these monies were expended on compensating the outside contractors, and therefore, were not readily available for payment of the beneficiary's salary in 1999. Further, the petitioner has not documented the positions, duties and termination of these workers who performed the duties of the proffered position. If they performed other kinds of work, then the beneficiary could not have replaced them as suggested.

The tax return for calendar year 1999 shows a taxable income of -\$916. The petitioner could not pay a salary of \$41,912.00 a year out of this figure.

The 2000 and 2001 federal tax returns for the restaurant continue to show that the petitioner lacked the ability to pay the proffered wage.

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 as of the priority date of the application for alien employment certification as required by 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). Therefore, the petition may not be approved.

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.