

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

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 07 2007
SRC-05-195-51551

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a software consulting firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a programmer analyst (systems analyst). As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner had not established its 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, 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 December 8, 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. 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.

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). 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).

The instant petition is for a substituted beneficiary.¹ The original Form ETA 750 was accepted on April 11, 2002. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$73,000 per year. The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires four years of college, a bachelor's degree or foreign equivalent in computer science, engineering, mathematics or related field, and two years of experience in the job offered or in the related occupation of systems engineer or systems administrator. The I-140 petition was submitted on June 30, 2005. The record shows that the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1998, to have a gross annual income of \$800,000, and to currently employ 10 workers. With the petition, the petitioner submitted a Form ETA 750B with information pertaining to the qualifications of the new beneficiary. On the Form ETA 750B signed by the beneficiary on June 28, 2005, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

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 appeal². Relevant evidence in the record includes the petitioner's corporate federal tax returns for 2002 through 2004 and bank statements for the petitioner's line of credit. The record does not contain any other evidence relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the wage.

On appeal, counsel contends that the director was wrong in determining the petitioner had a higher liability than assets for years 2002, 2003 and 2004, and asserts that with the petitioner's net current assets added to the net income and retained earnings, the petitioner establishes its ability to pay the proffered wage for these years.

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 evaluating whether a job offer is realistic, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) requires the petitioner to demonstrate financial resources sufficient to pay the beneficiary's proffered 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 during a given period, 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 beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner on the Form ETA 750B and on

¹ 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, 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 (March 7, 1996).

² 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 Form G-325A accompanying with the currently filed Form 485.³ The petitioner did not submit W-2 forms, 1099 forms or other compensation documents for the beneficiary. The director erred in concluding in her decision that the beneficiary was currently employed with the petitioner pursuant to an H-1B nonimmigrant visa and assuming that the petitioner had been paying the beneficiary a compensation rate of \$42,000 per year. The record does not contain any evidence showing that the petitioner hired and paid the beneficiary in any period from the priority date in 2002 to the present although the record shows that an I-129 petition for a nonimmigrant worker filed by the petitioner on behalf of the beneficiary was approved on May 16, 2005 for a period from May 16, 2005 to September 6, 2006. Therefore, the petitioner did not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage. The petitioner is obligated to demonstrate that it could pay the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the year 2002 of the priority date onwards with its net income or net current assets.

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). Reliance on the petitioner's total income and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's total income exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages 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. Reliance on the petitioner's depreciation in determining its ability to pay the proffered wage is misplaced. The court in *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava* specifically rejected the argument that the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. The court in *Chi-Feng Chang* further 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 in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a C corporation. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. The petitioner's tax returns for 2002 through 2004 demonstrate the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$73,000 per year from the priority date:

³ On the Form G-325A signed by the beneficiary on June 28, 2005 the beneficiary claimed that he worked for American Physicians Assurance in East Lansing, Michigan from June 2003 to the present.

- In 2002, the Form 1120 stated a net income⁴ of \$18,896.
In 2003, the Form 1120 stated a net income of \$16,634.
- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated a net income of \$2,036.

Therefore, for the years 2002 through 2004, 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.⁵ Counsel's assertion on appeal that Schedule L, line 9, Other investments, should be included in the petitioner's current assets is misplaced. A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. The petitioner's 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. In the instant case, the petitioner's tax returns for 2002 through 2004 demonstrate the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$73,000 per year from the priority date:

- In 2002, the petitioner had current assets of \$38,456, and current liabilities of \$177,757, and therefore, its net current assets were \$(139,301).
- In 2003, the petitioner had current assets of \$3,741, and current liabilities of \$186,878, and therefore, its net current assets were \$(183,137).
- In 2004, the petitioner had current assets of \$10,801, and current liabilities of \$29,321, and therefore, its net current assets were \$(18,520).

Therefore, for the years 2002 through 2004, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.

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

⁴ Taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions as reported on Line 28 of the Form 1120.

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

of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, its net income or net current assets.

Counsel asserts in his brief accompanying the appeal that there is another way to determine the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date. The petitioner submitted bank statements for its credit line account and counsel asserts that the petitioner's line of credit could establish its ability to pay the proffered wage. However, in calculating the ability to pay the proffered salary, CIS will not augment the petitioner's net income or net current assets by adding in the corporation's credit limits, bank lines, or lines of credit. A "bank line" or "line of credit" is a bank's unenforceable commitment to make loans to a particular borrower up to a specified maximum during a specified time period. A line of credit is not a contractual or legal obligation on the part of the bank. *See Barron's Dictionary of Finance and Investment Terms*, 45 (1998).

Moreover, the petitioner's existent loans will be reflected in the balance sheet provided in the tax return or audited financial statement and will be fully considered in the evaluation of the corporation's net current assets. Comparable to the limit on a credit card, the line of credit cannot be treated as cash or as a cash asset. However, if the petitioner wishes to rely on a line of credit as evidence of ability to pay, the petitioner must submit documentary evidence, such as a detailed business plan and audited cash flow statements, to demonstrate that the line of credit will augment and not weaken its overall financial position. Finally, CIS will give less weight to loans and debt as a means of paying salary since the debts will increase the firm's liabilities and will not improve its overall financial position. Although lines of credit and debt are an integral part of any business operation, CIS must evaluate the overall financial position of a petitioner to determine whether the employer is making a realistic job offer and has the overall financial ability to satisfy the proffered wage. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977).

Counsel recommends the use of retained earnings to pay the proffered wage. Retained earnings are the total of a company's net earnings since its inception, minus any payments to its stockholders. That is, this year's retained earnings are last year's retained earnings plus this year's net income. Adding retained earnings to net income and/or net current assets is therefore duplicative. Therefore, CIS looks at each particular year's net income, rather than the cumulative total of the previous years' net incomes represented by the line item of retained earnings.

Further, even if considered separately from net income and net current assets, retained earnings might not be included appropriately in the calculation of the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage because retained earnings do not necessarily represent funds available for use. Retained earnings can be either appropriated or unappropriated. Appropriated retained earnings are set aside for specific uses, such as reinvestment or asset acquisition, and as such, are not available for shareholder dividends or other uses. Unappropriated retained earnings may represent cash or non-cash and current or non-current assets. The record does not demonstrate that the petitioner's retained earnings are unappropriated and are cash or current assets that would be available to pay the proffered wage.

Counsel requests that CIS prorate the proffered wage for the portion of the year that occurred after the priority date. We will not, however, consider 12 months of income towards an ability to pay a lesser period of the proffered wage any more than we would consider 24 months of income towards paying the annual proffered wage. While CIS will prorate the proffered wage if the record contains evidence of net income or payment of the beneficiary's wages specifically covering the portion of the year that occurred after the priority date (and only that period), such as monthly income statements or pay stubs, the petitioner has not submitted such evidence.

On appeal counsel also suggests that CIS consider that the cash method of accounting used in the petitioner's tax returns does not accurately reflect the health of the petitioner's business or its ability to pay the proffered wages by ignoring major balance sheet items in entirety such as accounts receivable. The petitioner's tax returns were prepared pursuant to cash convention, in which revenue is recognized when it is received, and expenses are recognized when they are paid. This office would, in the alternative, have accepted tax returns prepared pursuant to accrual convention, if those were the tax returns the petitioner had actually submitted to IRS.

This office is not, however, persuaded by an analysis in which the petitioner, or anyone on its behalf, seeks to rely on tax returns or financial statements prepared pursuant to one method, but then seeks to shift revenue or expenses from one year to another as convenient to the petitioner's present purpose. If revenues are not recognized in a given year pursuant to the cash accounting then the petitioner, whose taxes are prepared pursuant to cash rather than accrual, and who relies on its tax returns in order to show its ability to pay the proffered wage, may not use those revenues as evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage during that year. Similarly, if expenses are recognized in a given year, the petitioner may not shift those expenses to some other year in an effort to show its ability to pay the proffered wage pursuant to some hybrid of accrual and cash accounting. The amounts shown on the petitioner's tax returns shall be considered as they were submitted to IRS, not as amended pursuant to the accountant's adjustments. If the accountant wished to persuade this office that accrual accounting supports the petitioners continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, then the accountant was obliged to prepare and submit audited financial statements pertinent to the petitioning business prepared according to generally accepted accounting principles.

Counsel advocates combining the petitioner's net income with its net current assets to demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. This approach is unacceptable because net income and net current assets are not, in the view of the AAO, cumulative. The AAO views net income and net current assets as two different ways of methods of demonstrating the petitioner's ability to pay the wage--one retrospective and one prospective. Net income is retrospective in nature because it represents the sum of income remaining after all expenses were paid over the course of the previous tax year. Conversely, the net current assets figure is a prospective "snapshot" of the net total of petitioner's assets that will become cash within a relatively short period of time minus those expenses that will come due within that same period of time. Thus, the petitioner is expected to receive roughly one-twelfth of its net current assets during each month of the coming year. Given that net income is retrospective and net current assets are prospective in nature, the AAO does not agree with counsel that the two figures can be combined in a meaningful way to illustrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a single tax year. Moreover, combining the net income and net current assets could double-count certain figures, such as cash on hand and, in the case of a taxpayer who reports taxes pursuant to accrual convention, accounts receivable.

In addition, the petitioner has filed Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140) for 12 more workers since 1999. Therefore, the petitioner must show that it had sufficient income to pay all the wages at the priority date. Since the petitioner failed to demonstrate its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage to the instant beneficiary from its priority date to the present, the petitioner could not establish its ability to pay all the proffered wages to each of the beneficiaries from his or her own priority date until he or she obtains lawful permanent residence.

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 the Department of Labor.

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.