

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE: [Redacted]
EAC 04 168 52178

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER


Date: OCT 24 2006

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

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an Italian specialty 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.

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 regulation at 8 CFR § 204.5(l)(3)(i) 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.

(B) *Skilled workers.* 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.

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, 2001.¹ The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$13.17 per hour (\$27,393.60 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years experience.

On appeal, counsel submits a legal brief and additional evidence

Counsel states on appeal that the director's decision was "... based solely on ...the petitioner's 2001 Tax Return, they [sic] listed a net income of -\$1,574.00." The petitioner submitted tax returns for years 2001 and 2002, including other financial information.

The AAO reviews appeals on a de novo basis. *See Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989) It is worth emphasizing that that each petition filing is a separate proceeding with a separate record. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(d). In making a determination of statutory eligibility, CIS is limited to the information contained in the record of proceeding. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(ii). This discussion is based upon the record of proceeding.

Counsel states on appeal that depreciation and amortization deductions, and, the totality of available information can be used as evidence of the ability to pay the proffered wage. Counsel cites several unpublished AAO cases for propositions that, according to counsel, depreciation and amortization² established the ability to pay. While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions of CIS are binding on all its employees in the administration of the Act, unpublished decisions are not similarly binding. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a). The AAO reviews appeals on a de novo basis. *See Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989). Each of counsel's contentions has been discussed herein. Each case must be reviewed upon its own merits, and each case has its own particular fact situation.

Counsel also asserts that compensation to the owners of the petitioner and its officers can be utilized to pay the proffered wage. Counsel contends that the beneficiary replaced another cook whose salary "... was also consistently paid for several years."

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 returns for 2001 and 2002; a Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statement for 2001; statements of employees wages paid to the State of New Jersey for 2001 and 2002; and, copies of documentation concerning the beneficiary's qualifications as well as other documentation.

The director denied the petition on October 19, 2004, 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.

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 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 Intangible assets on a balance sheet are included as "other assets" and they are amortized over a term of years. Amortization is the equivalent of depreciation for those intangibles.

On appeal, counsel asserts does have the ability to pay the proffered wage.

Counsel has submitted the following documents to accompany the appeal statement: a legal memorandum, and, State of New Jersey statements of wages.

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 since January 2001. The petitioner paid the beneficiary \$15,262.85 in 2001, and, \$15,650.50 in 2002.

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. Counsel contends that gross sales and gross profits are evidence of the ability to pay the proffered wage. 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 \$27,393.60 per year from the priority date of April 30, 2001:

- In 2001, the Form 1120 stated taxable income loss³ of <\$1,574.00>.⁴
- In 2002, the Form 1120 stated taxable income loss of <\$33,962.00>.

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 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

³ IRS Form 1120, Line 28.

⁴ 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.

wage. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.⁵ 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 \$5,876.00 and \$6,271.00 in current liabilities. Therefore, the petitioner had <\$395.00> in net current assets. Since the proffered wage is \$27,393.60 per year, this sum is less than the proffered wage.
- In 2002, petitioner's Form 1120 return stated current assets of \$8,245.00 and \$9,900.00 in current liabilities. Therefore, the petitioner had <\$1,655.00>⁶ in net current assets. Since the proffered wage is \$27,393.60 per year, this sum is less than the proffered wage.

Therefore, for the period 2001 through 2002 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.

Petitioner's counsel advocates the addition of depreciation in the amount of \$13,388.00 in 2001, including depreciation and amortization taken as deductions in tax returns to eliminate or reduce the abovementioned deficiencies. Since depreciation is a deduction in the calculation of taxable income on tax Form 1120, this method would eliminate depreciation as a factor in the calculation of taxable income.

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

⁵ 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.

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.

⁷ 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

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.

Counsel contends the gross sales together with payroll amounts paid by the petitioner including the wages paid to the beneficiary lends credence to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. As already stated above, 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 the INS, now CIS, should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. The suggestion that expenses should be treated as assets available to pay the proffered wage is not persuasive. Wages paid to others cannot be used to prove the ability the ability to pay the proffered wage.

Counsel contends that officer compensation may be available to pay the proffered wage. Counsel offered no evidence to support this contention. No officer compensation was stated on the two tax returns submitted. However, in years 2001, the salary paid by the petitioner to the owner and his wife was \$23,900.00 and \$6,300.00. Since the business suffered a totaled loss of \$35,536.00 for years 2001 and 2002, it is not credible that the owners of the business would accept only a nominal sum for compensation from the business after paying the proffered wage in a business that has no taxable income and in fact had losses for the two years examined.

Counsel contends that the beneficiary replaced another cook whose salary "... was also consistently paid for several years." Counsel did not disclose the salary paid for the former position but asserts that the business has enough funds to "pay the differential in salary required." Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). The unsupported statements of counsel on appeal or in a motion are not evidence and thus are not entitled to any evidentiary weight. See *INS v. Phinpathya*, 464 U.S. 183, 188-89 n.6 (1984); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1980).

In the totality of all the evidence submitted in this case, there is evidence to demonstrate that the petitioner's business was in an unprofitable period in 2001 and 2002. For the years 2001 through 2002, the taxable income for the petitioner decreased from <\$1,574.00> to <\$33,962.00>. The net current asset value for those years is also negative, <\$395.00> and <\$1,655.00> in net current assets respectively in years 2001 and 2002.

Matter of Sonogawa, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (BIA 1967), relates to petitions filed during uncharacteristically unprofitable or difficult years but only in a framework of profitable or successful years. The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about

\$100,000. During the year in which the petition was filed in that case, the petitioner changed business locations and paid rent on both the old and new locations for five months. There were large moving costs and also a period of time when the petitioner was unable to do regular business. The Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner's prospects for a resumption of successful business operations were well established. The petitioner was a fashion designer whose work had been featured in *Time* and *Look* magazines. Her clients included Miss Universe, movie actresses, and society matrons. The petitioner's clients had been included in the lists of the best-dressed California women. The petitioner lectured on fashion design at design and fashion shows throughout the United States and at colleges and universities in California. The Regional Commissioner's determination in *Sonegawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere.

Unusual and unique circumstances have not been shown to exist in this case to parallel those in *Sonegawa*, to establish that the period examined was an uncharacteristically unprofitable period for the petitioner. Counsel asserts that the petitioner can reasonably expect its future profits to increase, with renovations completed in 2002. Other than counsel assertions, no evidence was submitted to support these statements. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). By the evidence presented, the petitioner has not proven its ability to pay the proffered wage.

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 two corporate tax returns 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.