



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE:



LIN 06 155 54618

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: DEC 04 2008

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.

John F. Grissom, Acting Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The nature of the petitioner's business activity is medical distribution. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a sales and marketing manager. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 9089 Application for Permanent Employment Certification approved by the U.S. 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 demonstrated that the appeal was properly filed, timely and made 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 denial dated February 5, 2007, 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 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 either 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 9089 Application for Permanent Employment Certification was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of 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 9089 Application for Permanent Employment Certification as certified by 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 9089 was accepted on December 30, 2005. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 9089 is \$27,830.00 per year.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a de novo basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial

decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's de novo authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.¹

Relevant evidence in the record includes copies of the following documents: the original Form ETA 9089 Application for Permanent Employment Certification approved by DOL; the petitioner's U.S. Internal Revenue Service Form 1120S tax return for 2005;² and, copies of documentation concerning the beneficiary's qualifications as well as other documentation.

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as an S corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1998 and to currently employ 14 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. The net annual and gross annual incomes were not stated on the petition. On the Form ETA 9089, signed by the beneficiary on April 10, 2006, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

On appeal, counsel asserts the following:

- That the petitioner has stated that the beneficiary is "integral to our company's expansion plans and opportunities;" and also has stated that with employment of the beneficiary there "exists a promise of more financial gains when the beneficiary starts to work with the petitioner."
- That "more significance should be given to financial gains the petitioner has made to date."

Accompanying the appeal, counsel submits additional evidence that includes the following documents:

- An explanatory letter from the petitioner dated March 5, 2007.
- An explanatory letter from the petitioner's accountant dated March 5, 2007.
- An explanatory letter from the petitioner's accounting firm dated March 5, 2007
- The petitioner's business checking account statement dated January 31, 2007.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an Form ETA 9089 Application for Permanent Employment Certification establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the Form ETA 9089 Application for Permanent Employment Certification, 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

¹ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the CIS 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).

² The petitioner submitted its tax return for 2004 but tax returns submitted for years prior to the priority date, in this case 2005, have little probative value in the determination of the ability to pay from the priority date. The return stated net income of <\$80,423.00> for 2004. The symbols <a number> indicate a negative number, or in the context of a tax return or other financial statement, a loss.

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. Counsel has submitted no wage and tax statements from the petitioner to the beneficiary for any year. In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date.

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 supported by federal case law. . *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 gross sales and profits that exceeded the proffered wage is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross sales and profits exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

The petitioner's tax return demonstrates the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay:

- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net income of <\$16,462.00.>

Since the proffered wage is \$27,830.00 per year, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage for year 2005.

If the net income the petitioner demonstrates it had available during the 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.³ A

³ 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.

corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6 and include cash-on-hand. Its 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.

- The petitioner's net current assets during 2005 were \$4,194.00 respectively.

Therefore, for the period for which the tax return was submitted, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.

Therefore, from the date the Form ETA 9089 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 of the priority date through an examination of its net income or net current assets.

The petitioner, the petitioner's accounting firm and counsel assert that there are other ways to determine the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date. According to regulation,⁴ copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements are the means by which the petitioner's ability to pay is determined.

Counsel contends, with the permanent employment of the beneficiary as a sales and marketing manager, its business income will increase. The assertions of the petitioner do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Further, in this instance, no detail or documentation has been provided to explain how the beneficiary's employment as a technical support specialist will significantly increase petitioner's profits since the beneficiary has been in the petitioner's employ since January 2005. The petitioner's assertion is erroneous. Proof of ability to pay begins on the priority date, that is December 30, 2005, when petitioner's Application for Permanent Employment Certification was accepted for processing by the U. S. Department of Labor. The petitioner's net income is examined from the priority date. It is not examined contingent upon some event in the future. This hypothesis cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the corporate tax returns.

Counsel's reliance on the balance in the petitioner's bank checking account dated January 31, 2007 is misplaced. First, bank statements 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. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage.

Counsel has stated on appeal that "more significance should be given to financial gains the petitioner has made to date." Since the petitioner has suffered a net income loss in 2004 and 2005 of <\$80,423.00> and <\$16,462.00> respectively, and even though both the president and general counsel of the petitioner, its accounting firm, and its own accountant state that the petitioner "will" show a profit for 2006 and 2007, no independent, objective and verifiable evidence was submitted according to the regulation above cited to support this assertion. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for

⁴ 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

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)).

The evidence submitted fails to establish that the petitioner has the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

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.