

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

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**

PUBLIC COPY

36

DATE: **SEP 02 2011** Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

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:

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 an IT consulting business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a software engineer. 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 February 20, 2008 denial, the primary 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), also provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

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 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on February 6, 2003. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$71,219.00 per year. The Form ETA 750 at part 14 states that the position requires a bachelor's degree in computer science or an engineering field and three years experience in the job offered or three years of experience in a related occupation, (security engineer, system administrator, or software engineer). The petitioner listed at part 15 special requirements to include: "must have three years of experience in: 1) Client-server and e-commerce application architecture using SUN Solaris and AIX Servers on a UNIX operating platform; 2) Creation of secure systems using Raptor Eagle and SUN Sunscreen firewalls, encryption technologies and operating system security; and 3) SAN administration using EMC Storage frames and EMC storage management."

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 an S corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1996 and that it currently employs six workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on July 29, 2002, the beneficiary does not claim to have been employed by the petitioner.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of a Form ETA 750 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, 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. The petitioner has not submitted any evidence to demonstrate that it employed the beneficiary from 2003 through 2006. Although the petitioner submitted a copy of a Form W-2 for the beneficiary for 2007 listing wages in the

¹ 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).

amount of \$66,136.46, it is not evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage from 2003 through 2006 and is only evidence of the petitioner paying partial wages in 2007. The petitioner must still establish that it could have paid the difference between the proffered wage (\$71,219.00) and the wages actually paid in 2007 (\$66,136.46). Counsel's argument on appeal that a proration of the 2007 wages to those months in which the beneficiary was employed in 2007 establishes the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage in 2007 is not persuasive. Although this may establish the petitioner's ability to pay the wage during the exact time period in which the wages were paid, this is not probative of the petitioner's ability to pay the wage for all of 2007. The petitioner would need to establish its financial ability for the quarter in 2007 in which the beneficiary was not employed. As the petitioner did not submit its 2007 tax return or audited financial statements, the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage for those times during which the beneficiary was not employed in 2007 has not been established. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg'l Comm'r 1972)).

Therefore, for the relevant years the petitioner has not established that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage.

If, as in this case, 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 receipts and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross receipts 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 USCIS 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 before the director closed on October 15, 2007, with receipt of the petitioner’s response to the director’s request for evidence. As of that date, the petitioner’s 2007 federal income tax return was not yet due. The petitioner’s 2006 tax return is the most recent return available before the director. As the petitioner submitted its Quarterly Federal Tax Returns, these will be considered *infra*. The proffered wage is \$71,219.00.

The petitioner’s 1120S² tax returns demonstrate its net income as shown in the table below:

² Where an S corporation’s income is exclusively from a trade or business, USCIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner’s IRS Form 1120S. However, where an S corporation has income, credits, deductions or other adjustments from sources other than a trade or business, they are reported on Schedule K. If the Schedule K has relevant entries for additional income, credits, deductions or other adjustments, net income is found on line 23 (1997-2003), line 17e (2004-2005), and line 18 (2006-2010) of Schedule K. See Instructions for Form 1120S, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (accessed March 28, 2011) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholders’ shares of the corporation’s income, deductions, credits, etc.). Because the petitioner had additional income, credits, deductions, or other adjustments shown on its Schedule K, the petitioner’s net income is found on Schedule K of its tax returns. In the instant matter, the petitioner’s Schedule K was used to determine the net income amounts.

- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net income of (\$203,135.00).
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net income of (\$36,940.00).
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net income of (\$29,586.00).
- In 2006, the Form 1120S stated net income of (\$29,254.00).

Therefore, for the years 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

As an alternate means of determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS may review the petitioner's net current assets. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.³ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. 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 return demonstrates its net current assets as shown in the table below:

- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of (\$35,423.00).
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of (\$58,129.00).
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of (\$35,694.00).
- In 2006, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of (\$21,231.00).

Therefore, the record does not demonstrate that the petitioner had sufficient net current assets in 2003, 2004, 2005, or 2006 to pay the proffered wage.

Therefore, from the date the labor certification 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 through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director failed to consider all of the facts and evidence in the case in order to obtain an accurate account of the petitioner's financial ability to pay the proffered wage.

Counsel asserts that the petitioner and [REDACTED], an S corporation, are commonly owned by one shareholder (100 percent shares) and that the petitioner is the "research and development division of [REDACTED]." Counsel asserts that based upon their business relationship, [REDACTED]

³According 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.

Inc. as well as the petitioner's tax returns (net income and net current assets) should be taken into consideration in establishing the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

Contrary to counsel's assertion, USCIS may not "pierce the corporate veil" and look to the assets of the corporation's owner or of sister corporations or limited liability companies to satisfy the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. It is an elementary rule that a corporation or limited liability company is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders. *See Matter of M*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958), *Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980), and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980). Consequently, assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

Counsel asserts that the petitioner is not obligated to show that it has paid the prevailing wage to the beneficiary, and is not required, prior to approval of the I-140 petition, to employ the beneficiary. Although the petitioner may not be obligated to demonstrate that it has paid the prevailing wage, it may establish that through the beneficiary's wages, and/or the petitioner's net income or its net current assets, it has the ability to pay the proffered wage since the priority date. It has not done so in this matter. Counsel also argues that the petitioner's total assets should be considered in evaluating its ability to pay the proffered wage. However, USCIS will not consider total assets that the petitioner uses in its business in evaluating its ability to pay the wage. Rather, as noted above, USCIS will consider current assets, balanced against current liabilities, in evaluating a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The evidence presented on appeal cannot be concluded to 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 Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612. The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* 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 *Sonogawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonogawa*, 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 this matter, the totality of the circumstances does not establish that the petitioner had or has the ability to pay the proffered wage in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 or in the portion of 2007 when the beneficiary was not employed. There are no facts paralleling those found in *Sonegawa* that are present in the instant matter to a degree sufficient to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner has not submitted evidence establishing its business reputation. Nor has the petitioner demonstrated the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses in the relevant years, other than those years just being unprofitable. The petitioner has not submitted evidence to establish that the beneficiary is replacing a former employee whose primary duties were described in the Form ETA 750. The tax returns demonstrated that the petitioner is in a decline. It had \$339,874.00 in gross receipts in 2003 but only \$219,000.00 in 2007, and all years were unprofitable. Although the petitioner submitted its 2007 Quarterly Tax Returns, these do not demonstrate a likelihood that the petitioner could have paid the proffered wage in the past years.

Accordingly, the evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner 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.