

BC

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

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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

File: [REDACTED] Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: OCT 23 2003

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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

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 Immigration and Citizenship Services (CIS) 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.

Robert P. Wiemann
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The petitioner is a health care staffing facility. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a registered nurse. As required by statute, the petition was accompanied by an application for blanket labor certification pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.10, Schedule A, Group I. The director determined the petitioner had not established its financial ability to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage as of the petition's priority date.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional evidence.

Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3), 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 or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States. This section also provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

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 17, 2002. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$17.50 per hour or \$36,400.00 per annum.

Initially, counsel submitted insufficient evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the wage offered. On March 28, 2002, the director requested additional evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In response, counsel submitted a copy of the petitioner's Form 1120 U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return for 2000 and an Income Projection for 2002.

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. The director noted that the projection document showed a net income loss of \$58,389 for the first quarter of 2002 and a projected income loss of \$3072,037 for the year. We note, however, that the petitioner's corporate tax return, Schedule L, reflects that it had \$146,826 in net current assets, which more

than meets the beneficiary's proffered wage.

On appeal, counsel submits a letter from the Chief Financial Officer of the petitioning entity which states that the petitioner employs over 350 nurses and that "LMR's actual net income for the 2nd quarter is \$100,005. Our projection for the year end is \$166,675."

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) state, in pertinent part, that in a case where the prospective United States employer employs 100 or more workers, the director may accept a statement from a financial officer of the organization which establishes the prospective employer's ability to pay the proffered wage. In this case, the petitioner has submitted a letter asserting that it has more than 100 employees and that it is financially viable.

The record does not contain any derogatory evidence which would persuade the Service to doubt the credibility of the information contained in the letter from the financial officer or the supporting documentation. Therefore, the petitioner has demonstrated its financial ability to pay the beneficiary's salary as of the petition's filing date.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the petitioner has met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.