


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

B6

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: [Redacted]  
EAC 05 041 50077

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER


Date: NOV 01 2006

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



PETITION: 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 Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a residential and commercial contractor. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a stonemason. 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 denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history of this case is documented in the record and is incorporated into this decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's February 16, 2005 decision denying the petition, the single issue in this case is whether the evidence establishes the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence.

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. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and who are members of the professions.

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 who are members of the professions.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii), 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 unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states:

*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. In a case where the prospective United States employer employs 100 or more workers, the director may accept a statement from a financial officer of the organization which establishes the prospective employer's ability to pay the proffered wage. In appropriate cases, additional evidence, such as profit/loss statements, bank account records, or personnel records, may be submitted by the petitioner or requested by [Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)].

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the petition's priority date, which is the date 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). The priority date in the instant petition is April 30, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$30.69 per hour for 35 hours per week, which amounts to \$55,855.80 annually.

The AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis. *See Dorr v. I.N.S.* 891 F.2d 997, 1002, n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including any new evidence properly submitted on appeal.

In the instant appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional evidence.

Relevant evidence submitted on appeal includes tax information relevant to an S corporation. Other relevant evidence in the record includes the petitioner's 2001 federal income tax return.

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).

On appeal, counsel states that the director "neglected to consider that the petitioner is an S Corporation and that as such, [the] petitioner's shareholders' personal assets received as 'compensation to officers' are the assets of the corporation." Counsel states further that the petitioner's 2001 federal tax return reflects that \$126,200.00 was paid as compensation to officers, part of which could have been paid to the beneficiary. Counsel states, in part: "Had the petitioner employed the beneficiary in 2001, the petitioner could have paid the beneficiary the proffered wage of \$55,855.80, and the remainder of the corporation's income would have been distributed among the officers."

It is noted that evidence in the record, namely the Form G-325A, Biographic Information, which was signed by the beneficiary on August 5, 2004, reflects that the beneficiary did work for the petitioner in 2001. In fact, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner from July 2000 through the "present." The record, however, does not contain any evidence that the petitioner paid the beneficiary a salary. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988).

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA 750 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA 750, the petitioner must establish that the job offer was realistic as of the priority date and that the offer remained realistic for each year thereafter, until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. The petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is an essential element in evaluating whether a job offer is realistic. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977). *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). For each year at issue, the petitioner's financial resources generally must be sufficient to pay the annual amount of the beneficiary's wages, although the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning business will be considered if the evidence warrants such consideration. *See Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, CIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed the beneficiary at the time the priority date was established. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, this evidence will be considered prima facie proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. In the instant case, on the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on April 14, 2001, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner beginning in (left blank) and continuing through the date of the ETA 750B. As discussed above, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner from July 2000 through the present on Form G-325A, Biographic Information, which was signed by the beneficiary on August 5, 2004. The record, however, contains no W-2 forms or other documentary evidence that the petitioner employed the beneficiary at a salary equal or greater than the proffered wage.

As another means of determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, CIS will next examine the petitioner's net income figure as reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return for a given year, 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). In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc.*, 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. 623 F. Supp. at 1084. The court specifically rejected the argument that the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. Finally, there is no precedent that would allow the petitioner to "add back to net cash the depreciation expense charged for the year." See *Elatos Restaurant Corp.*, 632 F. Supp. at 1054.

The evidence indicates that the petitioner is an S corporation. The record contains a copy of the petitioner's Form 1120S U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation for 2001. The record before the director closed on February 16, 2005 without requesting additional evidence from the petitioner. As of that date the petitioner's federal tax return for 2004 was not yet due. The petitioner, however, did not submit federal tax returns or other regulatory-prescribed evidence for 2002 and 2003. Thus, CIS is able to analyze the petitioner's federal tax return information for 2001 only.

Where an S corporation's income is exclusively from a trade or business, CIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner's Form 1120S. The instructions on the Form 1120S U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation state on page one, "Caution: Include only trade or business income and expenses on lines 1a through 21." Where an S corporation has income from sources other than from a trade or business, that income is reported on Schedule K. An S corporation's total income from its various sources are reported on lines 1 through 6 of the Schedule K, Shareholders' Shares of Income, Credits, Deductions, etc. For example, an S corporation's rental real estate income is carried over from the Form 8825 to line 2 of Schedule K. Similarly, an S corporation's income from sales of business property is carried over from the Form 4979 to line 5 of Schedule K. See Internal Revenue Service, Instructions for Form 1120S (2003), available at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-prior/i1120s--2003.pdf>; Instructions for Form 1120S (2002), available at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-prior/i1120s--2002.pdf>.

Similarly, some deductions appear only on the Schedule K. The cost of business property elected to be treated as an expense deduction under Section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code, rather than as a depreciation deduction, is carried over from line 12 of the Form 4562 to line 8 of the Schedule K. See Internal Revenue Service, Instructions for Form 4562 (2003), at 1, available at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-prior/i4562--2003.pdf>; Internal Revenue Service, Instructions for Form 1120S (2003), at 22, available at

<http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-prior/i1120s--2003.pdf>.

Where the Schedule K has relevant entries for either additional income or additional deductions, net income is found on Line 23 of the Schedule K, for income.

In the instant petition, the petitioner's tax return indicates income from activities other than from a trade or business or additional relevant deductions. Therefore the figures for ordinary income on line 21 of page one of the petitioner's Form 1120S tax return do not include portions of the petitioner's income or all of its relevant deductions. For this reason, the petitioner's net income must be considered as the total of its income from various sources as shown on the Schedule K, minus certain deductions which are itemized on the Schedule K. The results of these calculations are shown on Line 23 of the Schedule K, for income.

In the instant case, the petitioner's tax return shows the following amount for income on line 23, Schedule K as shown in the table below.

Tax year	Net income	Wage increase needed to pay the proffered wage	Surplus or deficit
2001	\$20,763.00	\$35,092.80	-\$35,092.80

The above information is insufficient to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage in any of the years at issue in the instant petition.

As an alternative means of determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wages, CIS may review the petitioner's net current assets. Net current assets are a corporate taxpayer's current assets less its current liabilities. Current assets include cash on hand, inventories, and receivables expected to be converted to cash within one year. A corporation's current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If a corporation's 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 net current assets are expected to be converted to cash as the proffered wage becomes due. Thus, the difference between current assets and current liabilities is the net current assets figure, which if greater than the proffered wage, evidences the petitioner's ability to pay.

Calculations based on the Schedule L attached to the petitioner's tax return yield the amount for year-end net current assets as shown in the following table.

Tax year	Net current assets	Wage increase needed to pay the proffered wage	Surplus or deficit
2001	\$6,226.00	\$49,629.80	-\$49,629.80

Therefore, for the year 2001, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.

For an S corporation, however, there are other considerations. The sole shareholder of a corporation has the authority to allocate expenses of the corporation for various legitimate business purposes, including for the purpose of reducing the corporation's taxable income. Compensation of officers is an expense category explicitly stated on the Form 1120S U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. For this reason, the petitioner's figures for

compensation of officers may be considered as additional financial resources of the petitioner, in addition to its figures for ordinary income.

The documentation presented here indicates that [REDACTED] holds 100 percent of the company's stock and performs the personal services of the residential and commercial contractor business. According to [REDACTED] 2001 IRS Form 1120S Compensation of Officers, reported on Line 7 of page 1, he elected to pay himself \$126,200 in 2001. It is noted that the record contains no evidence to corroborate this amount, such as Mr. [REDACTED] 2001 W-2 Form and/or quarterly wage reports.

CIS (legacy INS) has long held that it may not "pierce the corporate veil" and look to the assets of the corporation's owner to satisfy the corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. It is an elementary rule that a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders. *See Matter of M*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958), *Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980), and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980). Consequently, assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In the present case, however, CIS would not be examining the personal assets of the petitioner's owner, but, rather, the financial flexibility that the employee-owner has in setting his salary based on the profitability of his corporation. It is noted that the officer's compensation for 2001 is \$91,107.20 greater than the proffered wage minus the net income. The record of proceeding, however, does not contain evidence that would demonstrate that the sole officer could or would forego approximately 28 percent of his officer's compensation in 2001 that could be redistributed towards having sufficient funds to pay the difference between the wages actually paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage in that year. Further, as discussed above, the record of proceeding does not contain federal tax returns or other regulatory-prescribed evidence for 2002 and 2003.

Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax return 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 the Department of Labor.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the evidence in the record fails to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence.

In his decision, the director correctly stated the petitioner's net income in 2001<sup>1</sup>, and correctly calculated the petitioner's year-end net current assets for that year. The director found that those amounts failed to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage in that year. The decision of the director to deny the petition was correct, based on the evidence in the record before the director.

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> In his decision, the director inadvertently typed 2002, as opposed to 2001.