

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



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

PUBLIC COPY



B6

FILE:



EAC 03 263 52562

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **NOV 07 2005**

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Valdez".

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a Japanese steak and seafood restaurant, sushi bar. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a sushi head chef. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the Department of Labor. 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, and, that it had not established that the beneficiary has the requisite experience as stated on the labor certification petition. The director denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, the counsel submits a brief.

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 Form ETA 750 Application for Alien Employment Certification, was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the U.S. Department of Labor. 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 U.S. Department of Labor 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 March 16, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$880 per week (\$45,760.00 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years experience.

With the petition, counsel submitted copies of the following documents: a copy of the original Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the U.S. Department of Labor; a letter from the petitioner dated August 22, 2003; the petitioner's Form 941 "Employer's Quarterly Tax Return" for four calendar quarters; IRS Form 1120S tax returns for 2000, 2001, and 2002; a lease agreement; and, copies of documentation concerning the beneficiary's qualifications as well as other documentation.

Because the Director¹ determined the evidence submitted with the petition was insufficient to demonstrate the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, consistent with 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), the Director requested pertinent evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. The Director requested on November 28, 2003, a copy of the W-2 Wage and Tax Statements issued to the beneficiary by petitioner for years 2001 and 2002; copies of U.S. federal tax returns for 2001 and 2002; and, annual reports for 2001 and 2002 with audited or reviewed financial statements.

In response to the request for evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, counsel submitted the petitioner's 2001 and 2002 compiled financial statements as well as other documents.

The director denied the petition on May 14, 2004, finding that the evidence submitted did not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

On appeal, counsel asserts that according to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5 (g)(2) bank account records and personnel records will show the ability to pay the proffered wage.

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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. No evidence was submitted to show that the petitioner employed the beneficiary.

Alternatively, in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, CIS will examine the net income figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. 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). In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, the court held that the Service 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. *Supra* at 1084. The court specifically rejected the argument that the INS, now CIS, should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income.

The tax returns² demonstrated the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$45,760.00 per year from the priority date of March 16, 2001:

- In 2001, the Form 1120S stated taxable income of \$20,488.00.
- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated taxable income of \$13,045.00.

¹ The Director also requested the original Certified Alien Employment Application on September 12, 2003.

² Since the priority date was March 16, 2001, tax returns for any prior years have little probative value of the ability to pay.

No precedent exists that would allow the petitioner to "add back to net cash the depreciation expense charged for the year." *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh, Supra* at 537. See also *Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava, Supra* at 1054.

The petitioner's net current assets can be considered in the determination of the ability to pay the proffered wage especially when there is a failure of the petitioner to demonstrate that it has taxable income to pay the proffered wage. In the subject case, as set forth above, the petitioner did not have taxable income sufficient to pay the proffered wage at any time between the years 2001 through 2002 for which the petitioner's tax returns are offered for evidence.

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.³ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. That schedule is included with, as in this instance, the petitioner's filing of Form 1120S federal tax return. The petitioner's year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If a corporation's end-of-year net current assets are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage.

Examining the Forms 1120S U.S. Income Tax Returns submitted by the petitioner, Schedule L found in each of those returns indicates the following:

- In 2001, petitioner's Form 1120S return stated current assets of \$4,569.00 and \$9,285.00 in current liabilities. Therefore, the petitioner had \$4,716.00 in net current assets. Since the proffered wage was \$45,760.00 per year, this sum is less than the proffered wage.
- In 2002, petitioner's Form 1120S return stated current assets of \$7,090.00 and \$2,528.00 in current liabilities. Therefore, the petitioner had \$4,562.00 in net current assets. Since the proffered wage was \$45,760.00 per year, this sum is less than the proffered wage.

Therefore, for the period 2001 through 2002 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 ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage at the time of filing through an examination of its net current assets.

Counsel asserts in his brief accompanying the appeal that there is another way to determine the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date through examination of compiled financial statements for 2001 and 2002, bank account records and personnel records. Counsel cites no legal precedent for the contention, and, according to regulation,⁴ copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements are the means by which petitioner's ability to pay is determined.

A compilation is limited to presenting in the form of financial statements information that is the representation of management. An audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards to obtain reasonable assurance whether the financial statements of the business are free of material misstatement. A review is a financial statement between an audit and a compilation. Reviews are governed

³ 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 as accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

⁴ 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

by the AICPA's (American Institute of Certified Public Accountants) Statement on Standards for Accounting and Review Services (SSARS) No.1. Accountants only express limited assurances in reviews. A compilation is the management's representation of its financial position. Compiled financial statements submitted in this matter have little probative value.

The unaudited Profit and Loss statements submitted are not persuasive evidence. According to the plain language of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), where the petitioner relies on financial statements as evidence of a petitioner's financial condition and ability to pay the proffered wage, those statements must be audited. Unaudited statements are the unsupported representations of management. The unsupported representations of management are not persuasive evidence of a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Thus, the unaudited Profit and Loss statements are of little evidentiary value in this matter.

Counsel mentions bank accounts in his appeal statement to show the ability to pay the proffered wage. Counsel has not submitted bank account records in this matter. Still, counsel's reliance on the balances in the petitioner's bank account is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), required to illustrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. While this regulation allows additional material "in appropriate cases," the petitioner in this case has not demonstrated why the documentation specified at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) is inapplicable or otherwise paints an inaccurate financial picture of the petitioner. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. Third, no evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the funds reported on the petitioner's bank statements somehow reflect additional available funds that were not reflected on its tax return, such as the cash specified on Schedule L that will be considered below in determining the petitioner's net current assets.

Counsel mentions personnel records in his appeal statement in this matter but he has not submitted complete personnel records or given reasons why such records would support the appeal. He has submitted the petitioner's Form 941 "Employer's Quarterly Tax Return" for 2002 and 2003 which have some but not all of the information also found on the federal tax returns mentioned above.

Counsel's contentions cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the two corporate tax returns as submitted by petitioner that by any test demonstrates that petitioner could not pay the proffered wage from the day the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor.

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.