

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



B6

FILE:



Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUL 25 2006

EAC-04-059-52165

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 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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is an auto 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, counsel submits a brief statement and additional evidence.¹

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 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. See 8 C.F.R. §204.5(d).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on March 15, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$24.48 per hour (\$50,918.40 per year). On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1992, and to currently employ 10 workers. The petitioner did not provide information on its gross and net annual income. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner was structured as an S corporation

¹ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. See *Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988). The AAO will first evaluate the decision of the director, based on the evidence submitted prior to the director's decision. The evidence submitted for the first time on appeal will then be considered.

and its fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on February 23, 2001, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

The petitioner submitted the petition with its compiled financial statements as of December 31, 2001. Because limited reliance can be placed on the validity of the facts presented in the compiled financial statements, the director issued a request for evidence (RFE) on August 11, 2004, requesting additional evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of March 15, 2001 and continuing to the present. The director specifically requested the petitioner's 2001, 2002 and 2003 United States federal income tax returns or annual reports with audited financial statements, and the beneficiary's Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statements. In response to the RFE, the petitioner submitted its tax returns for 2001, 2002 and 2003. On November 16, 2004 the director denied the petition, finding that the submitted tax returns show that the petitioner did not have sufficient net income or net current assets to cover the beneficiary's proffered wage, therefore, did not establish that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage for the years 2001 through 2003.

On appeal, counsel argues with a letter from the petitioner's accountant that the depreciation expense is a non-cash expense, and should be added back for cash-flow purposes to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage for 2003. Counsel also claims that the director overlooked evidence and information submitted in response to the director's RFE that included a letter from the petitioner's accountant that the beneficiary's wages were increased in 2003 and his work hours decreased due to his wife's illness.

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, 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. In the instant case, the petitioner submitted a letter in response to the director's RFE stating that the beneficiary's work hours for the year 2003 was reduced substantially and resumed fulltime work status as of April 2004. However, the petitioner did not submit the beneficiary's W-2 forms or other compensation documents showing the petitioner hired and paid the beneficiary any amount of compensation in any year from 2001, the year of the priority date, through 2004.

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). The petitioner's reliance on its gross receipts with depreciation and on wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross receipts exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid compensation to officers 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 the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now 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 should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. On appeal counsel submits a letter from the petitioner's accountant claiming that the depreciation expenses

should be added back to net income in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Counsel's reliance on depreciation is misplaced. The court in *Chi-Feng Chang* further clearly noted:

Plaintiffs also contend the depreciation amounts on the 1985 and 1986 returns are non-cash deductions. Plaintiffs thus request that the court *sua sponte* add back to net cash the depreciation expense charged for the year. Plaintiffs cite no legal authority for this proposition. This argument has likewise been presented before and rejected. *See Elatos*, 632 F. Supp. at 1054. [CIS] and judicial precedent support the use of tax returns and the *net income figures* in determining petitioner's ability to pay. Plaintiffs' argument that these figures should be revised by the court by adding back depreciation is without support.

(Emphasis in original.) *Chi-Feng* at 537.

The evidence indicates that the petitioner is an S corporation. The record contains copies of the petitioner's Form 1120S U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation for 2001, 2002 and 2003. The tax returns demonstrate the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$50,918.40 per year from the priority date.

In 2001, the Form 1120S stated net income² of \$(6,423.13).

In 2002, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$27,978.69.

In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$48,126.

Therefore, for the years 2001 through 2003, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the 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. The petitioner's total assets include depreciable assets that the petitioner uses in its business. Those depreciable assets will not be converted to cash during the ordinary course of business and will not, therefore, become funds available to pay the proffered wage. Further, 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.³ 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 the total of a corporation's end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets.

Calculations based on the Schedule L's attached to the petitioner's tax returns yield that the petitioner had net current assets of \$19,301.77 in 2001, \$36,215.44 in 2002 and \$13,405 in 2003. Therefore, the petitioner did

² Ordinary income (loss) from trade or business activities as reported on Line 21.

³ 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.

not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage of \$50,918.40 per year for the years 2001 through 2003.

Therefore, from the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the U. S. Department of Labor, the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets.

Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax returns as submitted by the petitioner that demonstrates that the petitioner could not 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.