





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B6



FILE: EAC 02 174 52706 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **AUG 02 2004**

IN RE: Petitioner: 
Beneficiary: 


PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Other Worker Pursuant to § 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

PUBLIC COPY

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

The petitioner is a food service business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a fast food cook. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the Department of Labor, accompanies the petition. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition.

On appeal, the petitioner's representative submits a statement and indicates that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. To date, no additional documentation has been received; therefore, a decision will be determined based on the record, as it is currently constituted.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) 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 unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

The regulation at 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 in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

Eligibility in this matter hinges on the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the wage offered beginning on the priority date, the day the request for labor certification was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). Here, the request for labor certification was accepted on October 29, 2001. The proffered salary as stated on the labor certification is \$9.50 per hour or \$19,760 per year.

With the petition, the petitioner's representative failed to submit any evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date and continuing to present. On August 19, 2002, the director requested evidence of that ability to pay the proffered wage to be in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements. The director specifically requested a copy of the petitioner's 2001 U.S. federal tax return with all schedules and attachments.

In response, the petitioner submitted copies of its profit and loss statements for the period ended September 30, 2002. Although the petitioner's representative indicated that the profit and loss statements were audited, there is nothing in the record, which corroborates this claim.

The director determined that the evidence submitted did not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date and, on January 8, 2003, denied the petition.

On appeal, the petitioner's representative states:

The Service Decision of January 8, 2003 was made in error because the petitioner apparently had the ability to pay the proffered wage at the time of filing and continuing to present.

We realize that the federal rules require the petitioner to show evidence of her financial ability to pay the proffered wage at the time of filing and continue [sic] to present. However, the petitioner's business tax return for the year 2002 is not available at this time because she has not yet closed the company's book.

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) will first examine whether the petitioner employed the beneficiary at the time the priority date was established. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, this evidence will be considered prima facie proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. In the present matter, the petitioner did not provide evidence that it employed the beneficiary from 2001 to the present or that the beneficiary was compensated at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage in those years.

As an alternate means of determining the petitioner's ability to pay, the AAO will next examine the petitioner's net income figure as reflected on the 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 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 CIS had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns, rather than on the petitioner's gross income. 623 F. Supp. at 1084. The court specifically rejected the argument that CIS 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.

If the petitioner does not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered salary, the AAO will review the petitioner's net current assets. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities. Net current assets identify the amount of "liquidity" that the petitioner has as of the date of filing and is the amount of cash or cash equivalents that would be available to pay the proffered wage during the year covered by the tax return. As long as the AAO is satisfied that the petitioner's current assets are

sufficiently "liquid" or convertible to cash or cash equivalents, then the petitioner's net current assets may be considered in assessing the prospective employer's ability to pay the proffered wage.

Since this office has not received any additional evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, the petitioner has not overcome the director's denial. As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), the petitioner must establish its ability to pay the proffered wage from the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. In the instant case, the priority date is October 29, 2001, and the petitioner has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage in 2001 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.