



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data needed to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



B6

FILE: LIN 03 131 52656 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 15 2005

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:



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

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center. The petitioner filed a motion to reopen/reconsider the decision that was granted. The director's decision was affirmed. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an automobile repair shop. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an automobile mechanic. 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. The director denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, the 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 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.

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the Form ETA 750 Application for Alien Employment Certification, was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the U.S. Department of Labor. The petitioner must also demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its Form ETA 750 Application for Alien Employment Certification as certified by the U.S. Department of Labor and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on April 30, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$24.02 per hour (\$49,961.60 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires three years experience.

With the petition, counsel submitted copies of the following documents: the original Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the U.S. Department of Labor; U.S. Internal Revenue Service Form tax return for 2001; the beneficiary's W-2 Wage and Tax Statement for 2001; and, copies of documentation concerning the beneficiary's qualifications as well as other documentation.

Because the Director determined the evidence submitted with the petition was insufficient to demonstrate the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, consistent with 8

C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), the Director requested pertinent evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. The Director requested additional evidence to prove petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. It requested the petitioner's "Employers Quarterly Federal Tax Form" (Form 941) and "State Unemployment Compensation Report Form" identifying employees by name and social security number.

In response to the request for evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, counsel submitted the petitioner's U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Form 1120S tax return for 2002; the beneficiary's 2002 and 2003 W-2 Wage and Tax Statements; a 2003 income statement; and, business bank statements as well as other evidence.

The director denied the petition on May 10, 2004 finding that the evidence submitted did not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

On a motion to reopen/reconsider the decision, counsel asserted that the director did not consider the petitioner's cash asserts as evidenced by its bank statements in his determination. The petitioner submitted the petitioner's corporate bank statements from April 2001 through December 2003.

The director granted the motion, reviewed the additional evidence and affirmed the prior decision. He found that the bank statements submitted, while evidencing cash balances, are a factor in the determination of net current assets, and, that without the inclusion of current liabilities, are not probative of the ability to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner appealed the decision. Counsel asserts that the director should have considered the cash balance and the wages already paid to the beneficiary. Counsel submits copies of the following documents: the beneficiary's B-2 visa and I-94 Arrival/Departure card; the labor certification; the beneficiary's W-2 Forms for 2001, 2002, and 2003; the corporate bank statements for April 2001 through December 2003 as well as other documents.

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) will first examine whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary during that period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Evidence was submitted to show that the petitioner employed the beneficiary. In 2001, the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$18,000.00; in 2002 \$18,450.00; and, in 2003 \$14,850.00. Since the proffered wage is \$49,961.00, these wages are less than the proffered wage.

Alternatively, in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, 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, (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 that the Service had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns, rather than the petitioner's gross income. *Supra* at 1084. The court specifically rejected the argument that CIS should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income.

The tax returns demonstrated the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$49,961.60 per year from the priority date of April 30, 2001:

- In 2001, the Form 1120S stated taxable income of \$2,945.00.
- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated taxable income of \$2,340.00.

If the net income the petitioner demonstrates it had available during that period, if any, added to the wages paid to the beneficiary during the period, if any, do not equal the amount of the proffered wage or more, CIS will review the petitioner's assets. The sum of the wages paid for the years 2001 and 2002 added to the taxable income mentioned above for those two years does not equal the proffered wage in years 2001 and 2002.

The petitioner's net current assets can be considered in the determination of the ability to pay the proffered wage especially when there is a failure of the petitioner to demonstrate that it has taxable income to pay the proffered wage. . In the subject case, as set forth above, the petitioner did not have taxable income sufficient to pay the proffered wage at any time between the years 2001 through 2002 for which the petitioner's tax returns are offered for evidence.

CIS will consider *net current assets* as an alternative method of demonstrating the ability to pay the proffered wage. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.¹ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. That schedule is included with, as in this instance, the petitioner's filing of Form 1120 federal tax return. The petitioner's year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If a corporation's end-of-year net current assets are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner failed to submit Schedule "L" from the returns.

Counsel asserts in her statements accompanying the appeal that there are other ways to determine the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date. Counsel cites no legal precedent for the contention, and, according to regulation,² copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements are the means by which petitioner's ability to pay is determined.

Counsel asserts that the monthly balance in the bank account statements submitted prove the ability to pay the proffered wage. Counsel's reliance on the balances in the petitioner's bank account is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), required to illustrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. While this regulation allows additional material "in appropriate cases," the petitioner in this case has not demonstrated why the documentation specified at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) is inapplicable or otherwise paints an inaccurate financial picture of the petitioner. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. Third, no evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the funds reported on the petitioner's bank statements somehow reflect additional available funds that were not reflected on its tax return, such as the cash specified on Schedule L that will be considered below in determining the petitioner's net current assets.

¹ According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3rd ed. 2000), "current assets" consist of items having (in most cases) a life of one year or less, such as cash, marketable securities, inventory and prepaid expenses. "Current liabilities" are obligations payable (in most cases) within one year, such as accounts payable, short-term notes payable and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

² 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

The unaudited income statement that petitioner submitted is not persuasive evidence. According to the plain language of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), where the petitioner relies on financial statements as evidence of a petitioner's financial condition and ability to pay the proffered wage, those statements must be audited. Unaudited statements are the unsupported representations of management. The unsupported representations of management are not persuasive evidence of a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Thus, the unaudited income statement for 2003 is of little evidentiary value in this matter.

Counsel recommends the use of retained earnings to pay the proffered wage. Retained earnings are the total of a company's net earnings since its inception, minus any payments made to stockholders. That is, this year's retained earnings are last year's retained earnings plus this year's net income. Adding retained earnings to net income and net current assets is therefore duplicative, at least in part.

Further, even if considered separately from net income and net current assets, a petitioner's retained earnings may not be appropriately included in the calculation of the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage, because they do not necessarily represent funds available for disposition. The amount shown as retained earnings on the petitioner's tax return may represent current or non-current, cash or non-cash assets. They may or may not represent assets of a type readily available to the employer pay to its employees in cash while continuing in business. They are not, therefore, a clear and convincing index of a company's ability to pay additional wages.

Counsel's contentions cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the two corporate tax returns as submitted by petitioner that show that the petitioner has not demonstrated its ability to pay the proffered wage from the day the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor.

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.