



BA

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536

[Redacted]

FEB 03 2003

File: EAC 01 228 60666 Office: Vermont Service Center Date:

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

[Redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other Worker Pursuant to § 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii).

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[Redacted]

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision 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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

*Robert P. Wiemann*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a religious organization. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a religious instructor. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification approved by the Department of Labor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the financial ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date of the visa petition.

On appeal, the petitioner provides a statement and additional evidence.

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 or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

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.

Eligibility in this matter hinges on the petitioner's ability to pay the wage offered as of the petition's priority date, which is the date the request for labor certification was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor. Matter of Wing's Tea House, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the petition's priority date is September 20, 1995. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$33,658.00 per annum.

Counsel initially submitted no evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. On November 13, 2001, the director requested additional evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage at the time of filing to include the petitioner's 1995 Form 990, Return of Organizations Exempt from Income Tax.

In response counsel submitted an unaudited financial statement for the period ended December 31, 1995.

The director concluded that the evidence submitted did not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the filing date of the petition and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, the petitioner provides copies of the petitioner's unaudited financial statements for the period from 1995 to 2000, and a letter from its accountant which states that he has reviewed the financial reports and testifies that they were prepared in accordance with the Internal Revenue Service's regulations.

Counsel also provides a copy of the beneficiary's 1995 Form 1040 U.S. Individual Income Tax Return which shows wages earned of \$18,200. Counsel has not provided, however, a copy of the beneficiary's 1995 Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statement or a 1995 Form-1099 Miscellaneous Income which establishes that those earnings were received from the petitioner.

Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence, however, is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. See Matter of Treasure Craft of California, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Accordingly, after a review of the additional documentation furnished, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had sufficient available funds to pay the salary offered as of the priority date of the petition.

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.