




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE:



Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date:

SEP 29 2008

EAC 04 073 51020

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 (AAO) on appeal. The case will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a construction and restoration company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a stonemason. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). 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.

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 in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's January 11, 2005 denial, the single issue in this case is whether or not the petitioner has the 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 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 DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). 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 DOL 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 27, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$23.70 per hour (\$49,296.00 per year based on a 40 hour work week). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the job offered or two years of experience or education in masonry or irrigation related trade.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The instant petition is for a substituted beneficiary. An I-140 petition for a substituted beneficiary retains the same priority date as the original ETA 750. Memo. from Luis G. Crocetti, Associate Commissioner,

The AAO takes a *de novo* look at issues raised in the denial of this petition. *See Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>2</sup> Counsel submits no new evidence on appeal. Relevant evidence in the record includes IRS Forms 1040, U.S. Individual Income Tax Returns, for [REDACTED] for 2001, 2002 and 2003 and the results of a Connecticut sales use tax audit conducted by the State of Connecticut Department of Revenue Services on [REDACTED] for the period from January 1, 1997 through June 30, 2001.<sup>3</sup> The record does not contain any other evidence relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the wage.

On the petition, the petitioner claimed to currently employ two independent contractors. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on April 25, 2001, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner is a sole proprietorship, and that the director failed to take into account the proprietor's assets and the net profits from his business in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

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).

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 has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date in 2001 or subsequently.

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

---

Immigration and Naturalization Service, to Regional Directors, *et al.*, *Substitution of Labor Certification Beneficiaries*, at 3, [http://ows.doleta.gov/dmstree/fm/fm96/fm\\_28-96a.pdf](http://ows.doleta.gov/dmstree/fm/fm96/fm_28-96a.pdf) (March 7, 1996).

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>3</sup> Evidence preceding the priority date of April 27, 2001 is not necessarily dispositive of the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. Further, state tax audit documents are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), required to illustrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. While this regulation allows additional material "in appropriate cases," the petitioner in this case has not demonstrated why the documentation specified at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) is inapplicable or otherwise paints an inaccurate financial picture of the petitioner.

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 claims to be a sole proprietorship, a business in which one person operates the business in his or her personal capacity. **Black's Law Dictionary 1398 (7th Ed. 1999)**. Unlike a corporation, a sole proprietorship does not exist as an entity apart from the individual owner. See *Matter of United Investment Group*, 19 I&N Dec. 248, 250 (Comm. 1984). Therefore the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income, assets and personal liabilities are also considered as part of the petitioner's ability to pay. Sole proprietors report income and expenses from their businesses on their individual (Form 1040) federal tax return each year. The business-related income and expenses are reported on Schedule C and are carried forward to the first page of the tax return. Sole proprietors must show that they can cover their existing business expenses as well as pay the proffered wage out of their adjusted gross income or other available funds. In addition, sole proprietors must show that they can sustain themselves and their dependents. *Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

In *Ubeda*, 539 F. Supp. at 650, the court concluded that it was highly unlikely that a petitioning entity structured as a sole proprietorship could support himself, his spouse and five dependents on a gross income of slightly more than \$20,000 where the beneficiary's proposed salary was \$6,000 or approximately thirty percent (30%) of the petitioner's gross income.

In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it operates as a sole proprietorship. The petitioner submitted IRS Forms 1040, U.S. Individual Income Tax Returns, for [REDACTED] for 2001, 2002 and 2003. The returns show no Schedule C business income for 2001, 2002 or 2003, and Schedule C was not attached to any of the proprietor's tax returns.<sup>4</sup> 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)).

However, even assuming that the petitioner is a sole proprietorship, the sole proprietor has not established that he can cover his existing business expenses, support himself and pay the proffered wage out of his adjusted gross income or other available funds. The proprietor's tax returns indicate that he is single and that he

---

<sup>4</sup> The results of a Connecticut sales use tax audit conducted by the State of Connecticut Department of Revenue Services on [REDACTED] for the period from January 1, 1997 through June 30, 2001 indicate that Mr. [REDACTED] failed to file quarterly Connecticut sales and use tax returns for tax years 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000. The results also indicate that he underreported income on his Connecticut sales and use tax returns for the first two quarters of 2001. The audit results state that the petitioner had no sales records, contracts or invoices for any relevant period and, therefore, the audit results are based on the petitioner's bank statements. Counsel urges this office to accept the results of a tax audit based on incomplete records to support the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. However, since the Connecticut tax authorities determined that the petitioner had no sales records for the first two quarters of 2001 and that the petitioner underreported his income for the first two quarters of 2001, the reliability of his 2001 federal income tax return is doubtful. 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).

supports himself. The proprietor's tax returns reflect that the proprietor's adjusted gross income was \$34,149.24 in 2001, \$32,682.90 in 2002 and \$33,650.23 in 2003. Therefore, in 2001, 2002 and 2003, the sole proprietorship's adjusted gross income fails to cover the proffered wage of \$49,296.00. It is improbable that the sole proprietor could support himself on a deficit, which is what remains after reducing the adjusted gross income by the amount required to pay the proffered wage.

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.