


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE: [Redacted] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: JUL 28 2008
WAC 06 045 53348

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.


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 nature of the petitioner's business is auto repair. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an auto mechanic. 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 (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 October 23, 2006, 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 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 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 30, 2001.¹ The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$19.66 per hour (\$40,892.80 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the proffered position.

¹ It has been approximately seven years since the Application for Alien Employment Certification has been

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.²

Relevant evidence in the record includes copies of the following documents: the original Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by DOL; the petitioner's U.S. Internal Revenue Service Form 1120S tax returns for 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004, and the petitioner's telephone listing.

On May 2, 2006, the director issued a request for evidence to the petitioner. In response the petitioner submitted the following relevant evidence: the petitioner's U.S. Internal Revenue Service Form 1120S tax return for 2005; W-2 Wage and Tax Statements for 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 issued by the petitioner to its employees with Form W-3; the petitioner's Employers Quarterly Federal Tax Form (Form-941) statements for 2005; California Employment Development Department (EDD) Form DE-6, Quarterly Wage Reports for all employees for the last four quarters that were accepted by the State of California for 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 as well as other documents.

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 1992 and to currently employ three workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. The net annual income and gross annual income stated on the petition were <\$4,000.00>³ and \$650,000.00 respectively. On the Form ETA 750, signed by the beneficiary on April 30, 2001, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director's decision was in error because the petitioner was required to utilize sub-contractors at a much higher salary and could have paid the required salary if the beneficiary was able to be employed.

According to counsel, the petitioner reported a loss because the employer was unable to accept some jobs because of the inability to do the repairs, so that the employer was required to send these jobs to other shops or to a dealer. Further counsel asserts that if the petitioner had an in-house employee/mechanic, it would not have lost \$46,859.00 in 2001 paid to outside contractors.

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 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).

³ The symbols <a number> indicate a negative number, or in the context of a tax return or other financial statement, a loss.

According to the petitioner, during 2002 to 2004 the business had problems with “management and partnership,” lost customers and money and did not “have enough to keep many of our current employees,” could not accept major jobs because the business did not have a specialist and therefore because of poor service lost “many repetitive customers.”

The petitioner states that in 2005, because of the lack of someone “who can diagnose and repair diesel engines and knows about transmissions,” the business subcontracted repair work resulting in the loss of \$40,985.00 (the resulting subcontracting cost).⁴

According to the petitioner, with the permanent employment of the beneficiary as auto mechanic its business income will increase because it will save 60% over the cost of subcontracting services and the business would be able to accept major repair service jobs for European cars.

Accompanying the appeal, counsel submits an explanatory letter dated January 11, 2007, and the petitioner’s U.S. Internal Revenue Service Form 1120S tax returns for 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005.

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 (BIA 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 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 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 gross sales and profits that exceeded the proffered wage is misplaced. Showing

⁴ It is unclear if this is the total cost of repair without adjustment for the petitioner’s own costs had it completed the repairs.

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 returns demonstrate the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay:

- In 2001, the Form 1120S⁵ stated net income of \$26,306.00.
- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$2,732.00.
- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net income of <28,146.00>.
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net income of <\$4,051.00>.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$10,640.00.

Since the proffered wage is \$40,892.80 per year, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage for years 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 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.⁶ A 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 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 were <\$3,229.00>, \$6,828.00, <\$14,758.00>, <\$12,513.00> and <\$12,112.00>.

⁵ Where an S corporation's income is exclusively from a trade or business, CIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner's Form 1120S. The instructions on the Form 1120S, U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation, state on page one, "Caution, Include only trade or business income and expenses on lines 1a through 21."

Where an S corporation has income from sources other than from a trade or business, net income is found on Schedule K. The Schedule K form related to the Form 1120 states that an S corporation's total income from its various sources are to be shown not on page one of the Form 1120S, but on Schedule K, Shareholders' Shares of Income, Credits, Deductions, etc. See Internal Revenue Service, Instructions for Form 1120S, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (accessed July 25, 2008).

⁶ 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.

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 of the priority date through an examination of its net income or net current assets.

Counsel asserts in his/her 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 the petitioner's ability to pay is determined.

The petitioner contends, with the permanent employment of the beneficiary as an auto mechanic its business income will increase. The assertions of the petitioner 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). Further, in this instance, no detail or documentation has been provided to explain how the beneficiary's employment as an auto mechanic will significantly increase petitioner's profits. The petitioner's assertion is erroneous. Proof of ability to pay begins on the priority date, April 30, 2001, when the petitioner's Application for Alien Employment Certification was accepted for processing by DOL. 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 has not documented auto projects providing repair estimates, canceled checks to the petitioner for parts, expenses, and subcontractor services, paid invoices, or repair cost references. Counsel has not provided independent, objective evidence to document what portion of the petitioner's service work from 2001 through 2005 has involved repair of diesel engines, transmissions and European cars.

The record of proceedings does not name the sub-contractors, state their compensation, verify their contractual employment, and, provide evidence of the efficacy of the petitioner's intent to replace them with the beneficiary. The petitioner has not documented the position, duty, and contract price of the subcontractors who performed the duties of the proffered position that the beneficiary would replace. Therefore, sufficient evidence has not been presented to show the prospective savings that the petitioner would earn by employing the beneficiary in the occupation of an auto mechanic in lieu of the employment of sub-contractors.

The evidence submitted fails to establish that the petitioner has had 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.

⁷ 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).