


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



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

B6

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: [Redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 11 2008
EAC 05 130 50617

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other, Unskilled Worker Pursuant to § 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, 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 on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a restaurant/diner. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cook. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the U. S. 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.

According to the petition, the petitioner's business was established in 1995, and, at the time the petition was prepared, the petitioner employed 37 individuals.

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 unavailable.

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 regulation at 8 CFR § 204.5(l)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part:

(A) *General.* Any requirements of training or experience for skilled workers, professionals, or other workers must be supported by letters from trainers or employers giving the name, address, and title of the trainer or employer, and a description of the training received or the experience of the alien.

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 25, 2001.¹ The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$12.00 per hour (\$24,960.00) per year. Although the petitioner selected the check box selection on the

¹ It has been approximately five years since the Alien Employment Application has been accepted and the proffered wage established. According to the employer certification that is part of the application, ETA Form 750 Part A, Section 23 b., states "The wage offered equals or exceeds the prevailing wage and I [the

I-140 petition "Any other worker (requiring less than two years of training or experience)" the certified Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience.

On appeal, counsel submits a legal statement and additional evidence.

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; a U.S. Internal Revenue Service Form tax return; and, copies of documentation concerning the beneficiary's qualifications as well as other documentation.

Because the director determined, *inter alia*, 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 on May 2, 2005, pertinent evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

The director requested evidence in the form of copies of annual reports (for the years 2001 through 2004), U.S. federal tax returns for 2001, 2002, and 2004, and audited or reviewed financial statements.

As the evidence in the record of proceeding stated that the petitioner employed the beneficiary since February of 2001, the director requested that the petitioner provide copies of the beneficiary's W-2 Wage and Tax Statements for years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004.

In response to the request for evidence, counsel submitted, *inter alia*, copies of the following documents: the beneficiary's the petitioner's U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Form 1120 tax returns for years 2001, 2002 and 2003.

The director denied the petition on July 15, 2005, finding that the evidence submitted did not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.²

Counsel has submitted the following documents to accompany the appeal statement: compiled financial statements for 2001, 2002 and 2003.

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. Statements was submitted to show that the petitioner employed the beneficiary and paid him in cash. No amounts were stated.

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

employer] guarantee that, if a labor certification is granted, the wage paid to the alien when the alien begins work will equal or exceed the prevailing wage which is applicable at the time the alien begins work."

² In addition the director stated, "In addition, the statement regarding the beneficiary's work experience at the CoachHouse is not clear regarding the beneficiary's duties in that position. This issue should be addressed in any future filings with this Service."

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. Finally, no precedent exists that would allow the petitioner to "add back to net cash the depreciation expense charged for the year." *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh, Supra* at 537. *See also Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava, Supra* at 1054.

The tax returns demonstrated the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$24,960.00 per year from the priority date of April 25, 2001:

- In 2001, the Form 1120 stated taxable income³ of \$42,070.00.
- In 2002, the Form 1120 stated taxable income of \$901.00.
- In 2003, the Form 1120 stated no taxable income or loss of \$0.00.

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 2002 through 2003 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.⁴ 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.

Examining the Form 1120 U.S. Income Tax Returns submitted by the petitioner, Schedule L found in each of those returns indicates the following:

- In 2001, petitioner's Form 1120 return stated current assets of \$2,797.00⁵ and \$9,678.00 in current liabilities. Therefore, the petitioner had approximately <\$6,888.00>⁶ in net current assets. Since the proffered wage is \$24,960.00, this sum is less than the proffered wage.

³ IRS Form 1120, Line 28.

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

⁵ A partial copy was provided with numerals deleted.

⁶ The symbols <a number> indicate a negative number, or in the context of a tax return or other financial statement, a loss, that is below zero.

- In 2002, petitioner's Form 1120 return stated current assets of \$4,496.00 and \$12,398.00 in current liabilities. Therefore, the petitioner had <\$7,902.00> in net current assets. Since the proffered wage is \$24,960.00, this sum is less than the proffered wage.
- In 2003, petitioner's Form 1120 return stated current assets of \$2,687.00 and \$10,753.00 in current liabilities. Therefore, the petitioner had <\$8,066.00> in net current assets. Since the proffered wage is \$24,960.00, this sum is less than the proffered wage.

Therefore, for the period 2001 through 2003 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 ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage at the time of filing through an examination of its net current assets.

Counsel asserts in his brief accompanying the appeal that there are other ways to determine the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date. According to regulation,⁷ 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 petitioner had assets of over \$7,902.00 in 2002, and in 2003, \$8,066.00. Counsel is in error in his statements. According to the above calculations the petitioner had <\$6,888.00>, <\$7,902.00>, and <\$8,066.00> in net current assets in 2001, 2002 and 2003 respectively.

Counsel also asserts that the employer had assets of \$76,121.00 in 2001, \$64,020.00 in 2002, and \$50,784.00 in 2003 as taken from Schedule L, line 15. Line 15 is total assets on the return. Counsel then states that, therefore because of this, the petitioner had profits before depreciation. We reject the petitioner's assertion that the petitioner's total assets should have been considered in the determination of the ability to pay the proffered wage. 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.

There is established legal precedent against counsel's contention that depreciation may be a source to pay the proffered wage. The court in *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburg*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Tex. 1989) noted:

"Plaintiffs also contend that 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. (Original emphasis.) *Chi-Feng* at 537."

As stated above, following established legal precedent, CIS relied on the petitioner's net income without consideration of any depreciation deductions, in its determinations of the ability to pay the proffered wage on and after the priority date.

⁷ 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

Counsel contends that the wages the petitioner paid in years 2001, 2002 and 2003 are evidence of the ability to pay the proffered wage. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Wages already paid to others are not available to prove the ability to pay the wage proffered to the beneficiary at the priority date of the petition and continuing to the present.

Counsel submits compiled financial statements as proof of the ability to pay the proffered wage. A compilation is limited to presenting in the form of financial statements information that is the representation of management. An audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards to obtain reasonable assurance whether the financial statements of the business are free of material misstatement. A review is a financial statement between an audit and a compilation. Reviews are governed by the AICPA's (American Institute of Certified Public Accountants) Statement on Standards for Accounting and Review Services (SSARS) No.1. Accountants only express limited assurances in reviews. A compilation is the management's representation of its financial position. Evidence of the ability to pay shall be, *inter alia*, in the form of copies of audited financial statements with a declaration of the maker indicating their manner of preparation and certifying the financial statements to be audited. Non-audited financials have limited evidentiary weight in Service deliberations in these matters. The statements presented were not audited.

The evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

Counsel's contentions cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the corporate tax returns for 2002 and 2003 as submitted by petitioner that shows 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.