identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[redacted]

B6

FILE: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: NOV 07 2005
WAC 02 112 50187

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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:

[redacted]

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 director denied the employment-based preference visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an import/export and postal services company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an office manager. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor, accompanied 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, and that the beneficiary was qualified to perform the duties of the position, and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief and states that the director is not reading the job requirements correctly with regard to the beneficiary's qualifications, and that the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage.

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.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

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, the day the Form ETA 750 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 Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing on April 27, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is $18.10 per hour, which amounts to $37,648 annually.

With the petition, the petitioner submitted IRS Form 1120, federal corporate income tax return, for the year 2000, as well as a letter to the petitioner from [redacted] ated October 31, 2001. This letter, that states the accountant has not audited or reviewed the financial statements, accompanies the petitioner's balance sheet as of September 30, 2001 and a related statement of income for the three quarters of 2001.

Because the evidence submitted was insufficient to demonstrate the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, on November 1, 2002, the director requested additional evidence pertinent to that ability. In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), the director specifically requested that the petitioner provide a copy of its 2001 Form 1120 with all attachments and schedules, as well as a signed front page of the petitioner's 2000 Form 1120. In addition, the director requested copies of the petitioner's state of California EDD Form DE-6, Quarterly Wage Reports, for the last seven quarters, and that the forms should include the names, and social security numbers of the employees, along with the job titles and number of weeks/hours worked by employees each quarter alongside the name of each employee listed on the DE-6. The director further requested information as to who owned the remaining 20 per cent of the petitioner, why the petitioner listed only five employees on the I-140 petition, when in fact he has petitioned for 13 employees. The director also wanted the petitioner to explain how many employees specifically worked in the Maroa Food Corner, and how many employees worked in the import/export and mailbox portions of the business. The director further requested the address of the Maroa Food Corner, and asked the petitioner to explain in detail why the petitioner is requiring a bachelor's degree for the position of office manager to oversee five employees.

In response, counsel submitted a copy of the petitioner's 2004 federal tax return; the first page of its 2000 federal tax return, signed by the petitioner; a copy of Form DE-6 for the last eight quarters; a statement from the petitioner that addressed the director's questions as to company address, number of employees working in each facet of the petitioner's business and other issues; and finally a copy of the stock certificates showing legal ownership of the company. Counsel also noted that with regard to the educational requirements for the position, item #15 of the ETA 750A states that the petitioner will also accept two years of experience in the job offered or two years of experience as office manager or assistant officer manager in any industry in lieu of required educational training. Counsel states that according to the labor certification approved by the Department of Labor, the requirement for a bachelor's degree on the ETA 750 is not mandatory for the performance of the job duties. Counsel continues that those individuals who do not have the required experience, but have a bachelor's degree or equivalent, should also be able to function as office manger for the petitioner.

With regard to the documents submitted by counsel, the petitioner's federal income tax return for 2001 indicated an taxable income of $66,338. The eight DE-6 documents indicated the petitioner employed nine employees during the first quarter of 2001, and four to six employees for the remaining quarters.

In a cover letter, the petitioner stated that the petitioner maintained a franchise license from Mailboxes Etc. to operate a postal service and a business permit to operate retail sales in the state of California. The petitioner also imports various dry food items from China, Taiwan and Hong Kong for resale at the Maroa Food Corner, and also sells various simple pastries, snacks, and drinks from local suppliers. The petitioner's trade unit is primarily engaged in importing livestock equipment from China for resale in the Untied States. The petitioner also stated that it had a warehouse in Fresno in which these items were stocked.

The petitioner stated that it has always had individuals with at least a bachelor's degree to work at its trade unit and at least one person with a college degree to work at its postal unit. Since the petitioner maintained a small trade business, it has over the years tried to recruit individuals from China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong to work for it. The petitioner states that it submitted at least four H-1B petitions to the California Service Center over the past five years; however, only one managed to get a visa and work for the petitioner. The petitioner stated that this

individual only worked for it for three months. The petitioner's owner states that only one H-1B worke worked for the petitioner for about two years. The petitioner's owner also stated that it started its business in the United States with an E-2 visa. Out of the thirteen employees or petitioners that the director mentioned in his request of further evidence, the petitioner's owner stated that at least three petitions listed by the director belong to the petitioner because a total of three petitions, including the extension petition, were filed on his behalf. The petitioner's owner stated that an H-1B petition for the beneficiary was approved; however, the beneficiary was denied a change of status for what the petitioner believed was the Service Center's error. The petitioner's owner stated that it was in the process of recruiting two permanent workers, the beneficiary and a woman from Macau, who understood trade and has connections in Macau and Hong Kong. Finally the petitioner's owner explains that he is the majority owner with 80 percent of the stock shares, while his wife's brother in law, owned the other 20 percent of the business. The petitioner submitted copies of the petitioner's stock certificates.

On July 18, 2003, the director denied the petition. The director stated that the primary reason the petition was denied was because the petitioner had not established it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage. The director noted that the petitioner had been requested to explain why the I-140 petition only lists five employees, while the petitioner had petitioned for ten H-1B petitions and three I-140 petitions. The director acknowledged that four of the petitions were for the petitioner's owner, and that of the remaining six petitions, five appear to have been approved and one denied, that of the beneficiary in the instant petition. The director further stated that the petitioner claimed that only one individual, with an approved I-129 in May 1998 and an approved I-140 in January 2000, worked for the petitioner for about two years. The director then noted that, based on the Forms DE-6 for 2001 and 2002, no one who had been petitioned for by the petitioner and approved by a service center was listed as an employee.

The director also noted that the federal income tax return for 2000 submitted with the instant petition was compared to the tax return submitted with the petitioner's other pending application. The director stated that these two income tax returns were found to be completely different. The income tax form contained in the other petition showed taxable income of $1,603, while the tax return in the instant petition showed a taxable income of zero. The director stated that since the tax returns for 2000 did not match, the legitimacy of the income tax return submitted by the petitioner for 2001 was in question.

The director then examined whether the beneficiary was qualified to perform the duties of an office manager, as stipulated in the ETA 750. According to the director, the ETA 750 in section 14 requires a bachelor's degree or equivalent (in any field) and section 15 of the same document states that the petitioner will also accept two years of experience in the job offered or two years of experience as office manager or assistant officer manager in any industry in lieu of required educational training. The director then introduced a definition of managerial capacity outlined in the Act at Section 101(A)(44)(A).[1] Based on this definition, and the fact that the second I-140 petition is for an office supervisor or assistant manager, the director stated that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary is a manager or executive according to the Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) definition, or that a degree is a requirement for the position of officer manager for a business that employs four to six

[1] 8.C.F.R. § 204.5 (j)(2) also contains similar wording to define certain employment-based immigrant multinational executives and managers. This wording and that cited by the director do not appear relevant to the job description contained in the ETA 750 in the record.

individuals for the petitioner's three separate businesses. Furthermore the director stated that although the beneficiary is in possession of a bachelor's degree, the record did not reflect that the beneficiary had the two years of experience in the job offered as a manager or assistant manager, since the beneficiary on the form ETA 750 claimed to have been unemployed since June 1998 to the present.

Finally the director stated that notwithstanding his previous comments on the beneficiary's qualifications, the primary reason the petition was being denied is that the petitioner did not establish that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage. The director stated that although the petitioner's tax return for 2001 reflects taxable income of $66,338, and net current assets of $30,652, the petitioner's net current assets were not sufficient to pay the beneficiary's wage of $37,648, much less a second beneficiary's wage of $40,144.[2]

On appeal, counsel asserts that the ETA 750 was certified by the U.S. Department of Labor on December 10,2001. Counsel also states that the petitioner submitted its 2000 and 2001 federal tax returns, and that although the petitioner only broke even in 2000, it was able to generate a taxable income of $66,338 in 2001. Counsel further asserts that for purposes of the instant petition, the petitioner only needed to provide its 2001 and subsequent federal tax returns and/or audited financial statements, and that the petitioner's federal income tax return for 2000 is irrelevant to the proceedings.

Counsel further asserts that the petitioner has sufficient funds to pay the beneficiary's annual salary as the petitioner's 2001 taxable income of $66,338 is sufficient to cover the wage of $37,648. Counsel also asserts that the petitioner's net current assets of $30,652 combined with its taxable income of $66,338, or $96,990, is sufficient to cover the annual salary of the beneficiary, as well as the second beneficiary's annual salary. Counsel asserts that the director miscalculated the petitioner's financial position while reviewing its 2001 tax return. Counsel also cites Matter of *Sonegawa*, 12 I &N Dec. 612, (BIA 1967) which stated that the approval of visa petitions was not precluded by the fact that the petitioner's net profit for the previous years was not commensurate with the proffered wage where it is found that the petitioner's business had increased, and that the petitioner's expectations of continued increase in business and profits were reasonable expectations.

Counsel also cites to *Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava*, 632 F. Supp. 1049 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) that held, in part, if the tax return of the corporation seeking visa preference was open to differing interpretation, the onus was on the corporation to submit more conclusive evidence such as cash flow data or certified financial statements to clarify income figures reflected on its return. Counsel then states that CIS at a California Service Center liaison meeting on May 28, 2003 stated it would consider documentation that either showed the petitioner had paid the beneficiary the salary offered since the priority date; that the petitioner's net income was greater to or equal to the salary officers, or that the petitioner's net current assets were greater to or equal to the proffered wage. Counsel states that, based on the *Sonegawa* and *Elatos* decisions, CIS should have considered the petitioner's cash flow data, in the form of the petitioner's net current assets and taxable income, in determining whether or not the petitioner established it had the ability to pay the beneficiary's salary.

---

[2] The director multiplied the beneficiary's proffered hourly wage, $18.10 by 2080 hours to arrive at the beneficiary's annual wage. He also used a wage of $19.20 an hour multiplied by 2080 hours to arrive at the second beneficiary's annual wage. The record does not reflect any further information or documentation of the second beneficiary's hourly or annual wage.

With regard to the beneficiary's qualifications for the position, counsel states that based on the job requirements stated on the ETA 750, the beneficiary is considered qualified for the position by either possessing a bachelor's degree or two years of required experience. Counsel states that it believes the director is not reading the job requirements correctly.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner has sufficient funds to pay the proffered wage in 2001 by combining the petitioner's taxable income with its net current assets for the same year. It is noted that the comments attributed by counsel as reported at a California Service Center liaison meeting as CIS national standard operating procedures do not countenance the combination of the petitioner's taxable income and net current assets to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. All three types of documentation are individually alternative analyses for establishing the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

Net current assets are the difference between a corporation's current assets and current liabilities. Net current assets may properly be considered in determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Because of the nature of net current assets, however, demonstrating the ability to pay the proffered wage with net current assets is truly **an alternative** to demonstrating the ability to pay the proffered wage with income and wages actually paid to the beneficiary. Net current assets are not cumulative with income, but must be considered separately. This is because income is viewed retrospectively and net current assets are viewed prospectively. That is, for example; a 2001 income greater than the amount of the proffered wage indicates that a petitioner could have paid the wages during 2001 out of its income. Net current assets at the end of 2001 which are greater than the proffered wage indicate that the petitioner anticipates receiving roughly one-twelfth of that amount each month, and that it anticipates being able to pay the proffered wage out of those receipts. Therefore, the amount of the petitioner's net income is not added to the amount of the petitioner's net current assets in the determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, 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. The petitioner did not claim to have employed the beneficiary as of the priority date. . Without more persuasive evidence, the petitioner did not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage in 2001 and onward.

If the petitioner does not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage during that period, CIS will next 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). Showing that the petitioner's gross receipts exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient. In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. at 1084, the court held that CIS 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. The court specifically rejected the argument that the Service, now CIS, should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. With regard to the director's comments on the petitioner's 2000 federal income tax returns, as well as counsel's remarks, it is

noted that the priority date for the instant petition is April 2001. Therefore, as correctly stated by counsel, the petitioner's federal income tax return for 2000 is not dispositive.[3]

With regard to tax year 2001, the petitioner's taxable income, as reflected on line 28 of its tax return is $66,338. Since the proffered wage is $37,468, the petitioner's taxable income in 2001 is sufficient to pay the proffered wage. However, the petitioner has to establish that it had sufficient taxable income for both beneficiaries of the two petitions that the petitioner claims to have filed. The record currently does not reflect the proffered wage for the beneficiary of the second petition that the petitioner acknowledges filing; therefore, it is not possible to ascertain whether the petitioner's taxable income is sufficient to pay both salaries.

Nevertheless, counsel is correct that the petitioner's net income is not the only statistic that can be used to demonstrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. 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. In addition, the petitioner's total assets must be balanced by the petitioner's liabilities. Otherwise, they cannot properly be considered in the determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Rather, 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.[4] A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its 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 out of those net current assets. The tax returns reflect the following information for 2001:

	2001
Taxable income[5]	$ 66,338
Current Assets	$ 40,328
Current Liabilities	$ 9,640
Net current assets	$ 30,688

The petitioner has not demonstrated that it paid any wages to the beneficiary during 2001. In 2001, as previously illustrated, the petitioner shows a taxable income of $66,338 and positive net current assets of $30,688, and has

---

[3] It should also be noted that both counsel and the director described the petitioner's taxable income in 2000 as documented by the petitioner's Form 1120 as "zero." However, taxable income on IRS Form 1120, is the sum shown on line 28, taxable income before NOL deductions and special deductions. Thus, the petitioner's taxable income in 2000, as established by the Form 1120 in the record, is $36,078.

[4] 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 accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

[5] As previously stated, taxable income is the sum shown on line 28, taxable income before NOL deduction and special deductions, IRS Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return.

demonstrated the ability to pay the proffered wage. However, as stated previously, the petitioner has not established that it is capable of paying both the salary of the beneficiary in the instant petition and the second salary of another beneficiary in a second petition. Without more persuasive evidence, the petitioner has not established that it has the ability to pay the proffered wages of both beneficiaries; therefore it has not established that it is capable of paying the beneficiary's salary as of 2001 and onward. It should also be noted that based on the director's comments on multiple petitions, in any other deliberations over the instant petition, the petitioner should be requested to submit documentation as to the actual proffered wage for the second beneficiary and any other beneficiaries of other petitions filed during 2001.

With regard to the beneficiary's qualifications, to determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for an employment based immigrant visa as set forth above, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) must examine whether the alien's credentials meet the requirements set forth in the labor certification. The Application for Alien Employment Certification, Form ETA-750A, items 14 and 15, set forth the minimum education, training, and experience that an applicant must have for the position of office manager. In the instant case, item 14 describes the requirements of the proffered position as follows:

14.	Education	
	Grade School	8
	High School	4
	College	4
	College Degree Required	Bachelor's degree or equivalent
	Major Field of Study	Any field

The petitioner made no further specifications as to type of training or experience, but in section 15, Other Special Requirements, stated the following: Will also accept 2 years of experience in job offered or 2 years of experience as Office Manager or Assistant Office Manager in any industry in lieu of required educational training." Based on the wording in section 15, the petitioner is identifying the position as both a professional position and as a skilled worker position, requiring two years of work experience. In his denial of the petition, the director states that it did not appear that the beneficiary had the two years of work experience in the job offered or as a manager of assistant manager since the beneficiary claimed to have been unemployed since June 1998 to the present. Furthermore, in his denial, the director references a definition of managerial capacity that is not applicable to the ETA 750 certification for an I-140 petition.

The beneficiary set forth his credentials on Form ETA-750B. On Part 11, eliciting information of the names and addresses of schools, college and universities attended (including trade or vocational training facilities), he indicated that he attended California State University, Fresno, California and earned a bachelor's and master's degree in psychology. The petitioner also provided copies of the diplomas for these two degrees and college transcripts.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C), guiding evidentiary requirements for "professionals," states the following:

> If the petition is for a professional, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien holds a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and by evidence that the alien is a member of the professions. Evidence of a baccalaureate degree shall be in the form of an official college or university record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study. To show that the alien is a member of the professions, the petitioner must submit evidence that the minimum of a baccalaureate degree is required for entry into the occupation.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(B), guiding evidentiary requirements for "skilled workers," states the following:

> If the petition is for a skilled worker, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification, meets the requirements for Schedule A designation, or meets the requirements for the Labor Market Information Pilot Program occupation designation. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

Thus, for petitioners seeking to qualify a beneficiary for the third preference "skilled worker" category, the petitioner must produce evidence that the beneficiary meets the "educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification" as clearly directed by the plain meaning of the regulatory provision. And for the "professional category," the beneficiary must also show evidence of a "United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree." Thus, regardless of category sought, the petitioner must show that the beneficiary meets the requirements of the Form ETA 750A, which includes a baccalaureate degree.

In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, CIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. CIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant*, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm. 1986). *See also, Mandany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008, (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981). In the instant case, the petitioner must show that the beneficiary has the requisite education, training, and experience as stated on the Form ETA-750 which, in this case, includes a bachelor's degree in any field or two years of experience in the job offered or two years of experience as office manager or assistant officer manager in any industry in lieu of required educational training. The petitioner has established that the beneficiary has a bachelor's degree in the field of psychology, and as such as fulfilled terms of education outlined in the Form ETA 750. Since the beneficiary fulfilled the educational requirements, based on the wording of the Form ETA 750, he is not required to have two requisite years of work experience. Thus, the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the position.

Nevertheless, as stated previously, without more persuasive evidence as to other pending petitions or petitions filed during the 2001 priority year, the petitioner has not established that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage from the 2001 priority date and onward. Therefore, the director's decision shall stand, and the petition shall be denied. 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. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.