

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



B6

Date: JUN 25 2012 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE:

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to 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 employment based 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 restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a Chinese cook. As required by statute, an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor (DOL), 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.

On appeal, the petitioner submits additional evidence and contends that it has demonstrated its ability to pay the proffered wage.

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 if properly submitted upon appeal.

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 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 ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent 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 ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent 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 ETA Form 9089 was accepted on March 28, 2007, which establishes the priority date. The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$640 biweekly, which amounts to \$16,640

per year. The ETA Form 9089 states that the position of Chinese cook does not require any formal education or training, but requires 24 months (2 years) of work experience in the job offered of Chinese cook. No alternate occupation is acceptable.¹

The Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker was filed on May 21, 2007. Part 5 of the petition indicates that the petitioner was established on May 8, 1980, employs 47 workers, and declares a gross annual income of \$1,406,660 and a net annual income of \$47,190.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA Form 9089 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA Form 9089, 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 overall 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 record does not indicate that the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage, or any wages, from the priority date onward.

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.*

¹ Although the petitioner submitted a letter from the King City Restaurant in Trinidad, West Indies, dated February 5, 2009 and signed by [REDACTED] stating that the beneficiary's listed dates of employment were from December 1999 to the present (date of letter), these dates conflict with the dates listed in the ETA Form 9089. The beneficiary's employment with this employer is claimed to have begun in June 1999 to (no end date given). The petitioner must resolve this issue in any further filings. It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988).

Napolitano, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010), *aff'd*, No. 10-1517 (6th Cir. filed Nov. 10, 2011). 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).

In support of its ability to pay the proffered wage of \$16,640 per year, the petitioner has submitted copies of a Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return for 2006 and 2007. Both returns

indicate that the petitioner uses a fiscal year running from November 1st to October 31st of the following year. Thus, the period of time covered by the 2006 and 2007 federal tax returns is from November 1, 2006 to October 31, 2007 (2006 return) and from November 1, 2007 to October 31, 2008 (2007 return). The returns also contain the following information:

Year	2006	2007
Net income ²	-\$75,712	-\$12,448
Current Assets	\$60,951	\$66,609
Current liabilities	\$76,310	\$71,292
Net current assets	-\$15,359	-\$ 4,683

As shown in the above table, besides net income and as an alternative method of reviewing a petitioner's ability to pay a proposed wage, USCIS will also examine a petitioner's net current assets. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.³ Current assets would generally be shown on line(s) 1 through 6 of Schedule L of a Form 1120. Current liabilities are shown on line(s) 16 through 18 of Schedule L of a Form 1120. Net current assets represent a measure of liquidity during a given period and a possible resource out of which the proffered wage may be paid for that period. If a corporation's end-of-year net current assets are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the corporate petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage out of those net current assets.⁴

² The petitioner is a C corporation. For the purpose of this review of the petitioner's Form 1120 corporate tax returns, the petitioner's net income is found on line 28 on the Form 1120 (taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions). U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) uses a corporate petitioner's taxable income before the net operating loss deduction as a basis to evaluate its ability to pay the proffered wage in the year of filing the tax return because it represents the net total after consideration of both the petitioner's total income (including gross profit and gross receipts or sales), as well as the expenses and other deductions taken on line(s) 12 through 27 of page 1 of the Form 1120 corporate tax return. Because corporate petitioners may claim a loss in a year other than the year in which it was incurred as a net operating loss, USCIS examines a petitioner's taxable income before the net operating loss deduction in order to determine whether the petitioner had sufficient taxable income in the year of filing the tax return to pay the proffered wage.

³ A petitioner's total assets are not considered in this calculation. A petitioner's total assets include depreciable assets that the petitioner uses in its business. Those depreciable assets would not be converted to cash during the ordinary course of business and would 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.

⁴ According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3rd ed. 2000), "current assets"

It is noted that the petitioner asserts on appeal that new cooks are needed because some of the present ones are retiring. The petitioner also asserts that its tax returns are prepared on the accrual basis which means that some liabilities are reported when incurred not when paid, so that if they were added back, the net income, a profit would be shown for the tax year ending October 31, 2008.

As noted above, the accrual method recognizes revenue when it is earned and expenses are recognized when they are incurred. This office would, in the alternative, have accepted tax returns prepared pursuant to cash convention, if those were the tax returns the petitioner had actually submitted to IRS.

This office is not, however, persuaded by an analysis in which the petitioner seeks to rely on tax returns or financial statements prepared pursuant to one method, but then seeks to shift revenue or expenses from one year to another as convenient to the petitioner's present purpose. If revenues are not recognized in a given year pursuant to the accrual method then the petitioner, whose taxes are prepared pursuant to accrual, may not use those revenues as evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage during that year. Similarly, if expenses are recognized in a given year, the petitioner may not shift those expenses to some other year in an effort to show its ability to pay the proffered wage pursuant to some hybrid of accrual and cash accounting. The amounts shown on the petitioner's tax returns shall be considered as they were submitted to IRS, not pursuant to the accountant's adjustments.

Regarding the replacement of retiring cooks, the record does not, however, name these workers, state their wages, verify their full-time employment, or provide evidence that the petitioner has replaced or will replace them with the beneficiary. 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. 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.⁵

As set forth above, neither the petitioner's net income of -\$75,712 nor its -\$15,359 in net current assets, could cover the proffered wage of \$16,640 in 2006 or establish its continuing ability to pay

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.

⁵ The purpose of the instant visa category is to provide employers with foreign workers to fill positions for which U.S. workers are unavailable. If the petitioner is, as a matter of choice, replacing U.S. workers with foreign workers, such an action would be contrary to the purpose of the visa category and could invalidate the labor certification. However, this consideration does not form the basis of the decision on the instant appeal.

during this period. Similarly, in 2007, neither the petitioner's net income of -\$12,448, nor its net current assets of -\$4,683 could cover payment of the proffered wage. Therefore, from the priority date of March 28, 2007, the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing financial ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets.

USCIS may also 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 (Reg. Comm. 1967). 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 consider such factors as the number of years the petitioner has been doing business, the established historical growth of the petitioner's business, or the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses within a framework of profitable operations.

In the instant case, on appeal, the petitioner submits copies of its federal 2007 and 2008 W-3(s), Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statements and copies of its 2008 state quarterly tax reports. The petitioner asserts that he has been in business for over 20 years and has not been late with a payroll. The two federal income tax returns submitted to the record, however, indicate losses in both net income and net current assets. The record contains no evidence suggesting that unique or unusual circumstances analogous to those prevailing in *Sonogawa* that would merit an approval on this basis. Thus, assessing the overall 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.

Based on a review of the record, the evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing financial ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onward.

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.