

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

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

Citizenship and Immigration Services

BP

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE

CIS, AAO, 20 Mass. 3/F

425 I Street N.W.


Washington, D.C. 20536



File: WAC 02 100 56679 Office: California Service Center

Date: **MAR 12 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 (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an architecture and construction firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an architect. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the Department of Labor. 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, counsel argues that the beneficiary will perform some of the work previously done by consultants. Therefore, the payments petitioner paid to these consultants in the past be used to pay the beneficiary's salary.

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 petitioner'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 until the alien is granted permanent residence. The petitioner's priority date in this

instance is April 20, 2001. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$18.42 per hour or \$38,313.60 per year.

With the petition, counsel submitted copies of the petitioner's 1999 and 2000 Form 1065, U.S. Return of Partnership Income. The tax return for 1999 reflected ordinary income or loss from trade or business activities of negative \$7,043. The tax return for 2000 reflected ordinary income from trade or business activities of negative \$7,450.

In a request for evidence (RFE) dated March 25, 2002, the director requested additional evidence to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage from the time the priority date was established. In response, counsel submitted a signed but incomplete copy of the petitioner's 2001 Form 1065, and stated that the petitioner pays over \$160,000 per year in consulting fees.

The director determined that the evidence did not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage from the time the priority date was established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful residency, and denied the petition.

With the appeal, counsel submitted a letter from petitioner stating it pays consultants over \$130,000 per year to supplement its in-house services. The petitioner states that by employing the beneficiary, the company will save over \$80,000 per year.

The record does not reflect, however, the number of consultants, the specific work they performed, or how much of that work the beneficiary is expected to perform. Assertions by management of future savings, without more, are not evidence.

The petitioner's tax return for 2001 is incomplete as Line 22, ordinary income from trade or business activities, is left blank. However, it appears that the figure should be \$0. The return also shows current assets of negative \$125 and current liabilities of \$17,837. The petitioner could not have paid the proffered wage from current assets.

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, CIS will first examine the net income 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 CIS 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).

The petitioner is obliged by 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) to demonstrate the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. The evidence submitted does not demonstrate that the petitioner was able to pay the proffered wage during 2001. Therefore, the petitioner has not established that it has had the continuing ability to pay the proffered salary beginning on the priority date.

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.