

**PUBLIC COPY**

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

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

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



File: WAC 02 099 52851 Office: California Service Center Date: **JAN 27 2004**

IN RE: Petitioner:   
Beneficiary:

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:

**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 Citizenship and Immigration 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, 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 school of the performing arts. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a ballet instructor. 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, and continuing. Here, the petition's priority date is January 26, 1998. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$25.00 per hour or \$52,000.00 per annum.

Counsel submitted copies of the petitioner's 1998 through 2001 Form 1120 U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The tax return for 1998 reflected gross receipts of \$413,234; gross profit of \$210,262; compensation of officers of \$78,000; salaries and wages paid of \$28,600; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of \$0. The tax return for 1999 reflected gross receipts of \$469,855; gross profit of \$457,905; compensation of officers of \$78,000; salaries and wages paid of \$16,158; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of -\$10,487.

The tax return for 2000 reflected gross receipts of \$550,413; gross profit of \$537,184; compensation of officers of \$0; salaries and wages paid of \$84,239; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of \$9,919. The tax return for 2001 reflected gross receipts of \$708,297; gross profit of \$692,088; compensation of officers of \$120,000; salaries and wages paid of \$47,860; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of \$6,956.

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 submits a letter from the CEO of the petitioning entity who argues that he and his wife, the two stockholders of the corporation "would both gladly reduce our compensation in order to meet the requirement for [the beneficiary's] \$52,000.00 as we draw more salary then we spend."

The CEO's argument is not persuasive. The petitioning entity in this case is a corporation. Consequently, any assets of the individual stockholders including ownership of shares in other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. See *Matter of M*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958; AG 1958); *Matter of Aphrodite Investments Limited*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980); and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984)); see also *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Tex.

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 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

On appeal, counsel states that W-2s for the beneficiary show that she was paid \$28,000 in 1998; \$31,800 in 1999; \$32,800 in 2000; and \$39,060 in 2001; however, no W-2s were submitted in evidence. Even so, the petitioner would have been unable to make up the difference between the wage paid and the proffered wage from its net income in those years.

Accordingly, after a review of the evidence submitted, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had sufficient available funds to pay the salary offered as of the priority date 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.