

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]  
WAC-05-065-53075

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: JAN 03 2007

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, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a hospital. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a registered nurse. The petitioner asserts that the beneficiary qualifies for blanket labor certification pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.10, Schedule A, Group I. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification accompanied the petition. 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 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 July 13, 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, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), 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. In a case where the prospective United States employer employs 100 or more workers, the director may accept a statement from a financial officer of the organization which establishes the prospective employer's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. The priority date of any petition filed for classification under section 203(b) of the Act "shall be the date the completed, signed petition (including all initial evidence and the correct fee) is properly filed with [Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)]." 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 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 December 27, 2004. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$23.00 per hour (\$47,840 per year). On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been

established in 1979, to have a gross annual income of \$63 million, to have a net annual income of \$26 million, and to currently employ 420 workers. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on December 13, 2004, 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 appeal<sup>1</sup>. Relevant evidence in the record includes the petitioner's audited financial statements for 2001 through 2004 and a letter from the petitioner's chief financial officer. The record does not contain any other evidence relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the wage.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner's payroll of \$15,784,777 for 2004 and \$14,488,461 for 2003 and a gross income of \$41,246,115 with assets of \$154,954,610 for 2004 and a gross income of \$41,018,876 with assets of \$17,850,578 for 2003 establish its 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 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 general, 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) requires annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements as evidence of a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. That provides further provides: "In a case where the prospective United States employer employs 100 or more workers, the director *may* accept a statement from a financial officer of the organization which establish the prospective employer's ability to pay the proffered wage." (Emphasis added).

The petitioner claims to employ 420 workers and submitted a letter from its chief financial office (CFO), [REDACTED] to establish its ability to pay. However, given the record as a whole and the petitioner's history of filing petitions, we find that CIS need not exercise its discretion to accept the letter from the CFO. CIS records indicate that the petitioner has filed over 36 Form I-140 petitions with the California Service Center. In addition, the petitioner has also filed 53 Form I-129 nonimmigrant petitions. Consequently, CIS must also take into account the petitioner's ability to pay the petitioner's wages in the context of its overall recruitment efforts. Presumably, the petitioner has filed and obtained approval of the labor certifications on the representation that it requires all of these workers and intends to employ them upon approval of the petitions. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the petitioner to demonstrate that it has the ability to pay the wages of all of the individuals it is seeking to employ. If we examine only the salary requirements relating to the thirty-six I-140 petitions, the petitioner would be need to establish that it has the ability to pay combined salaries of

---

<sup>1</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). 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). However, counsel does not submit any new evidence on appeal.

\$1,722,240. Given that the number of immigrant and nonimmigrant petitions reflects an increase of 20 percent of the petitioner's workforce, we cannot rely on a letter from the CFO referencing the ability to pay a single unnamed beneficiary.

As we decline to rely on the CFO's letter, we will examine the other financial documentation submitted. These documents do not clearly support counsel's contention.

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 did not claim that the beneficiary had worked for it during the relevant years, and did not submit any evidence showing that the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary any compensation.

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 or audited financial statements, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses contrary to counsel's assertions. Counsel's reliance on the petitioner's gross income and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross 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. 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 record contains the petitioner's audited financial statements for 2001 through 2004. Since the priority date in this case is December 27, 2004, the financial statements for 2001 through 2003 are not necessarily dispositive. The AAO will first review and examine the audited financial statements for 2004, the year of the priority date. The audited financial statements for 2004 demonstrate that the petitioner had a net income of \$(475,499) in 2004. Therefore, for the year 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. We reject, however, counsel's idea that the petitioner's total assets should have been considered in the determination of the ability to pay the proffered wage. Counsel's reliance on the

petitioner's total assets in determining the petitioner's ability to pay is misplaced. The petitioner's total assets include depreciable assets that the petitioner uses in its business. Those depreciable assets including real estates 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.<sup>2</sup> A corporation's year-end current assets are shown under total current assets on Balance Sheets. Its year-end current liabilities are shown under total current liabilities on Balance Sheets. 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 submitted audited financial statements show that the petitioner had total current assets of \$8,992,844 and total current liabilities of \$11,464,560, and thus its net current assets during 2004 were \$(2,471,716). Therefore, for the year 2004, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.

In addition, the petitioner has filed another Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140) for 35 more workers. Therefore, the petitioner must show that it had sufficient income to pay all wages from the priority date to the date the beneficiary obtained the permanent resident status or the present for each of the beneficiaries.

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 wages paid to the beneficiary, or 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. Counsel advised that the beneficiary could be replacing an employee who resigned. The record does not, however, name the worker, state the wages, verify the full-time employment, or provide evidence that the petitioner has replaced or will replace him or her with the beneficiary. The assertions of counsel 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). Counsel claims that the petitioner established a payroll of \$15,784,777 for the year 2004. However, in general wages already paid to others are not available to prove the ability to pay the wage proffered to the beneficiary at the priority date of the petition and continuing to the present. Moreover, there is no evidence that the position of the resigned employee involves the same duties as those set forth in the Form ETA 750. The petitioner has not documented the position, duty, and termination of the worker who performed the duties of the proffered position. If that employee performed other kinds of work, then the beneficiary could not have replaced him or her. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings.

---

<sup>2</sup>According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3<sup>rd</sup> 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.

*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)).

Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the audited financial statements 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.