Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

B6

Date: MAY 2 6 2011 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER FILE: [redacted]
SRC

IN RE: Petitioner:
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:

[redacted]

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, with a fee of $630. 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, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a "mold making" business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States in a position entitled "moldmaker, die-casting and plastic molding." 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 July 18, 2008 denial, the 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 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, Application for Alien Employment Certification, 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 April 30, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is $15.50 per hour ($32,240 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the proffered position.

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.[1]

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a C corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1985, to have a gross annual income of $136,819, and to currently employ eight workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year runs from July 1st to June 30th. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on April 21, 2001, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

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, 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 Sonegawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, 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 onward. The petitioner did submit, however, the following W-2 Forms showing wages paid to the beneficiary:

- 2001 - $22,203
- 2002 - $23,030
- 2003 - $23,041
- 2004 - $23,367

[1] 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).

- 2005 - $25,400
- 2006 - $28,550
- 2007 - $32,327 (provided on appeal)

The W-2 Forms provided show that the beneficiary was paid wages by the petitioner in an amount which slightly exceeded the proffered wage in 2007. In years 2001 through 2006, the petitioner paid wages to the beneficiary, but less than the full proffered wage. Thus, it will be necessary for the petitioner to establish the ability to pay the difference between the full proffered wage and wages paid to the beneficiary in those years. Those sums are as follows:

- 2001 - $13,037
- 2002 - $9,210
- 2003 - $9,199
- 2004 - $8,873
- 2005 - $6,840
- 2006 - $3,690

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 return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. *River Street Donuts, LLC v. Napolitano*, 558 F.3d 111 (1st Cir. 2009); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010). 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 and wage expense 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.

In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. at 1084, the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now USCIS, 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 specifically rejected the argument that the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. *See Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d at 881 (gross profits overstate an employer's ability to pay because it ignores other necessary expenses).

With respect to depreciation, the court in *River Street Donuts* noted:

> The AAO recognized that a depreciation deduction is a systematic allocation of

> the cost of a tangible long-term asset and does not represent a specific cash expenditure during the year claimed. Furthermore, the AAO indicated that the allocation of the depreciation of a long-term asset could be spread out over the years or concentrated into a few depending on the petitioner's choice of accounting and depreciation methods. Nonetheless, the AAO explained that depreciation represents an actual cost of doing business, which could represent either the diminution in value of buildings and equipment or the accumulation of funds necessary to replace perishable equipment and buildings. Accordingly, the AAO stressed that even though amounts deducted for depreciation do not represent current use of cash, neither does it represent amounts available to pay wages.
>
> We find that the AAO has a rational explanation for its policy of not adding depreciation back to net income. Namely, that the amount spent on a long term tangible asset is a "real" expense.

River Street Donuts at 118. "[USCIS] 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." *Chi-Feng Chang* at 537 (emphasis added).

The record closed in this instance with the receipt by the director of the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence on March 10, 2008. As of that date, based on the petitioner's fiscal year, the petitioner's 2006 tax return would be the most recent return available.

For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2001 through 2006 as shown in the table below.

- In 2001, the Form 1120 stated net income of $22,795.
- In 2002, the Form 1120 stated net income of ($110,428).
- In 2003, the Form 1120 stated net income of ($123.166).
- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net income of $72,483.
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net income of ($210,257).
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net income of $132,357.

The petitioner's tax return would state sufficient net income to pay the difference between wages paid to the beneficiary and the full proffered wage in 2001, 2004 and 2006, however, USCIS records indicate that the petitioner filed an additional Form I-140 petition on January 6, 2005. The priority date for the labor certification supporting that petition is unclear. The petitioner would need to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage for each I-140 beneficiary from the priority date until the beneficiary obtains permanent residence. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). Whether the

petitioner could pay both sponsored workers in all of the relevant years is unclear as the second worker's wage and priority date is unknown.

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, USCIS 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, USCIS 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.[2] 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 tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets from 2001 through 2006 as shown in the table below.

- In 2001, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of ($24,053).
- In 2002, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of ($112,318).
- In 2003, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of ($191,967).
- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of ($74,507).
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of ($39,166).
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of $69,631.

As noted above, the petitioner's tax returns would state sufficient net income to pay the difference between the proffered wage and wages paid to the instant beneficiary in 2001, 2004 and 2006.[3] On appeal, the petitioner submitted a copy of the beneficiary's 2007 W-2 Form which showed wages paid exceeding the proffered wage. Thus, it is necessary to consider the petitioner's net current assets for years 2002, 2003 and 2005 in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the difference between wages paid to the beneficiary and the full proffered wage. The petitioner's tax returns state

---

[2]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 accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

[3]As noted above, it is unclear whether the petitioner can pay the proffered wage of the second worker as well in these years, if applicable.

negative net current assets in those years and does not establish the petitioner's ability to pay the required wage.

Therefore, from the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL, the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date (for the years 2002, 2003 and 2005) through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets. Whether the petitioner can pay the wage of the second worker in all the applicable years is unclear from the record.

On appeal, counsel states that the record establishes the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Specifically, the petitioner states that according to the language in a memorandum dated May 4, 2004, from William R. Yates, Associate Director of Operations, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), regarding the determination of ability to pay (Yates Memorandum), it has established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. *See* Interoffice Memo. from William R. Yates, Associate Director of Operations, USCIS, to Service Center Directors and other USCIS officials, *Determination of Ability to Pay under 8 CFR 204.5(g)(2)*, at 2, (May 4, 2004). Counsel asserts that Mr. Yates makes a clear distinction between past and current salaries and since he used the conjunction "or" in the context of evidence that the petitioner "has paid or currently is paying the proffered wage." Counsel urges USCIS to consider the wages paid to the beneficiary in 2007 ($32,327, which slightly exceeds the proffered wage) as satisfying that particular method of demonstrating a petitioning entity's ability to pay.

The Yates' Memorandum relied upon by counsel provides guidance to adjudicators to review a record of proceeding and make a positive determination of a petitioning entity's ability to pay if, in the context of the beneficiary's employment, "[t]he record contains credible verifiable evidence that the petitioner is not only employing the beneficiary but also has paid or is currently is paying the proffered wage."

The AAO consistently adjudicates appeals in accordance with the Yates Memorandum. However, counsel's interpretation of the language in that memorandum is overly broad and does not comport with the plain language of the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) set forth in the memorandum as authority for the policy guidance therein. The regulation requires that a petitioning entity demonstrate its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. If USCIS and the AAO were to interpret and apply the Yates Memorandum as counsel urges, then in this particular factual context, the clear language in the regulation would be usurped by an interoffice guidance memorandum without binding legal effect. The petitioner must demonstrate its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage, or in this instance the difference between wages paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage, beginning on the priority date, which in this case is April 30, 2001. Thus, the petitioner must show its ability to pay not only in 2007, when counsel claims it actually began paying the proffered wage rate, but it must also show its continuing ability to pay the required wage from 2001 through 2006. Demonstrating that the petitioner is paying the proffered wage in a specific year may suffice to show the petitioner's ability to pay for that year, but the petitioner must still demonstrate its ability to pay for the rest of the pertinent period of time.

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 (Reg. Comm. 1967). 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 the instant case, the petitioner had insufficient net income or net current assets to pay the difference between the proffered wage and wages paid to the beneficiary in 2002, 2003 and 2005. Although counsel states that the petitioner has been in business for 23 years, there is nothing in the record to establish that the petitioner has a history of sustained profitability and growth. The tax returns of the petitioner showed negative net income in 2002, 2003 and 2005, and negative net current assets in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005. The petitioner's tax returns do not reflect any officer compensation paid in a number of years. Additionally, the petitioner has sponsored a second worker during this time period and must establish that it can pay for all of its sponsored workers. The record does not establish that the petitioner's reputation in the industry is such that it is more likely than not that it has maintained the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from 2001 onward. Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

The evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

Additionally, the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary met the requirements of the labor certification by the priority date. An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v.*

DOJ, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

Regarding the beneficiary's qualifications for the position, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii) specifies that:

> (A) *General.* Any requirements of training or experience for skilled workers, professionals, or other workers must be supported by letters from trainers or employers giving the name, address, and title of the trainer or employer, and a description of the training received.
>
> (B) *Skilled workers.* If the petition is for a skilled worker, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification, meets the requirements for Schedule A designation, or meets the requirements for the Labor Market Information Pilot Program occupation designation. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant*, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm. 1986). To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's priority date. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

The Form ETA 750 requires two years of experience in the proffered position ("mold maker, die-casting and plastic molding"). The beneficiary signed the Form ETA 750 on April 21, 2001 and stated that he was employed by Argen Manufacturing in South Gate, California as a mold-maker in die casting from 1994 to 1999. The petitioner, however, failed to submit any letter in accordance with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii) to demonstrate that the beneficiary had the required two years experience to meet the terms of the certified labor cert. Accordingly, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary has the experience for the position, and the petition should have been denied on this basis as well.

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. 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.