

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

B6

FILE:

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

IN RE:

Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

**NOV 22 2010**

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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently \$585, but will increase to \$630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the \$630 fee. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew  
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 petitioner is a farm/boarding stable for horses. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a stable manager pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii). As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States 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 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 May 8, 2008 denial, the single issue in this case is whether the petitioner has established its 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 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 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the 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 750 as certified

by the 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 November 4, 2002. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$17.51 per hour (\$36,420.80 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years work experience in the job offered.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>2</sup>

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a sole proprietorship. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1985 and to currently employ 2 full-time and 2 part-time workers. On the Form ETA 750, signed by the beneficiary on June 26, 2002, the beneficiary claims to have been employed by the petitioner since November 2000.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of a Form ETA 750 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the Form 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, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) 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, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) 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 in 2002 onwards. The petitioner submitted as evidence payroll records that indicate that the petitioner has paid the beneficiary on a cash basis from 2002 through 2007; however, the record is devoid of any Form 1099-MISC to substantiate such claim. Further, the payroll records are not sufficiently identified with the petitioner and thus their credibility has not been established. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not

---

<sup>2</sup> The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1).

sufficient for 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)).

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, USCIS will next examine the net income figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax returns, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. *River Street Donuts, LLC v. Napolitano*, 558 F.3d 111 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 2009). 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).

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is a sole proprietorship. The petitioner has failed to establish by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary during 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006, at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage; therefore, USCIS will next examine the net income figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation, to determine its ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage with sufficient funds remaining to support the proprietor's family.

A sole proprietorship is a business in which one person operates the business in his or her personal capacity. Black's Law Dictionary 1398 (7th Ed. 1999). Unlike a corporation, a sole proprietorship is not legally separate from its owner. Therefore, the sole proprietor's income, liquefiable assets, and personal liabilities are also considered as part of the petitioner's ability to pay. Sole proprietors report income and expenses from their businesses on their individual (Form 1040) federal tax return each year. The business-related income and expenses are reported on Schedule C and are carried forward to the first page of the tax return. Where the sole proprietor is unincorporated, the gross income is taken from the IRS Form 1040, line 33, 35 and 37, respectively. Sole proprietors must show that they can cover their existing business expenses as well as pay the proffered wage. In addition, they must show that they can sustain themselves and their dependents. *Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647, *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571.

In *Ubeda*, 539 F. Supp. at 650, the court concluded that it was highly unlikely that a petitioning entity structured as a sole proprietorship could support himself, his spouse and five dependents on a gross income of slightly more than \$20,000 where the beneficiary's proposed salary was \$6,000 or approximately thirty percent (30%) of the petitioner's gross income.

In the instant case, the sole proprietor's IRS Forms 1040 reflect her adjusted gross income (AGI) as follows:

- In 2002, the proprietor's IRS Form 1040 stated AGI of \$269,620.00.

- In 2003, the petitioner's IRS Form 1040 stated AGI of (\$13,453.00).
- In 2004, the petitioner's IRS Form 1040 stated AGI of (\$29,954.00).
- In 2005, the petitioner's IRS Form 1040 stated AGI of (\$82,203.00).
- In 2006, the petitioner's IRS Form 1040 stated AGI of (\$139,407.00).

In the instant matter, other than for 2002, the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income is not sufficient to pay the proffered wage. The evidence demonstrates that from 2003 through 2006, the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The director determined that the proprietor had failed to provide a list of her monthly reoccurring household expenses. Counsel states on appeal that the sole proprietor's husband pays all recurring household expenses. Counsel's statement is supported by a sworn statement issued by the sole proprietor's husband who states that he, not the sole proprietor, is responsible for all household expenses. A copy of an unsigned letter from [REDACTED] indicates that the petitioner's husband has sufficient assets to pay the household expenses. This evidence sufficiently establishes that the petitioner's husband covers all household expenses. Thus, household expenses will not be deducted from the petitioner's assets in determining whether the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage.

The record includes evidence of assets owned by the sole proprietor including: the farm house and several other parcels of real estate, an IRA and other annuity accounts. Counsel asserts that the value of the sole proprietor's real property should be considered in determining her ability to pay the proffered wage. Contrary to counsel's claim, real estate is not a readily liquefiable asset. Further, it is unlikely that the sole proprietor would sell such significant assets to pay the beneficiary's wage. It is speculative to claim that funds from the sale of real property would be available specifically to be used to pay the proffered wage. *See 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)). Further, any funds which may be generated from the sale of any of the real property would only be available at some point in the future. A petitioner must establish its ability to pay from the date of the priority date, which in this case is November 4, 2002. A petition cannot be approved at a future date after eligibility is established under a new set of facts. *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm. 1971).

On appeal, the sole proprietor submits statements evidencing liquid assets sufficient to pay the proffered wage in 2007 and 2008. However, there are no statements of liquid assets from 2003 through 2006 sufficient to substantiate the petitioner's claims. The statement from The [REDACTED] [REDACTED] are dated 2008; the net value statement from [REDACTED] is dated 2007 and 2008; and the parcel access rolls statements valuations are dated 2007. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the sole proprietor had liquefiable assets sufficient to pay the proffered wage in 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. As noted above, going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these

proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, at 165. Hence, the petitioner has failed to establish its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from 2003 through 2006.

Counsel's assertions and the evidence presented on appeal do not outweigh the evidence of record that demonstrates that the petitioner could not pay the proffered wage from the day the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL.

USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's business activities in its determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. See *Matter of Sonegawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612. The petitioning entity in *Sonegawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about \$100,000. During the year in which the petition was filed in that case, the petitioner changed business locations and paid rent on both the old and new locations for five months. There were large moving costs and also a period of time when the petitioner was unable to do regular business. The Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner's prospects for a resumption of successful business operations were well established. The petitioner was a fashion designer whose work had been featured in *Time* and *Look* magazines. Her clients included Miss Universe, movie actresses, and society matrons. The petitioner's clients had been included in the lists of the best-dressed California women. The petitioner lectured on fashion design at design and fashion shows throughout the United States and at colleges and universities in California. The Regional Commissioner's determination in *Sonegawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonegawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of a petitioner's net income and net current assets. USCIS may consider such factors as the number of years the petitioner has been doing business, the established historical growth of the petitioner's business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry, whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service, or any other evidence that USCIS deems relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In weighing the totality of the circumstances in this case, the evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. The petitioner has not established the existence of any facts paralleling those in *Sonegawa*. The record is devoid of evidence pertaining to the petitioner's business reputation. The petitioner has failed to establish whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or outsourced service. The petitioner has not indicated any uncharacteristic business expenses or losses which made 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 unusually difficult or unprofitable years. The evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

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.