

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



Be

FILE: [Redacted]
EAC 03 093 50593

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **AUG 22 2006**

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:

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
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 cleaning service. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a rug cleaner/supervisor. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the U. S. 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. The director denied the petition accordingly.

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 regulation at 8 CFR § 204.5(l)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part:

(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 or the experience of the alien.

(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.

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 April 10, 2001.¹ The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$27.84 per hour (\$57,907.20 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years experience.

With the petition, counsel submitted copies of the following documents: the original Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the U.S. Department of Labor; U.S. Internal Revenue Service Form tax return for 2001; a bank statement; and, copies of documentation concerning the beneficiary's qualifications as well as other documentation.

In response to the request for evidence, counsel submitted copies of the following documents: the beneficiary's W-2 Wage and Tax Statements for 2001, 2002 and 2003 as well as bank statements.

The director denied the petition on December 29, 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 the petitioner maintained monthly account balances of between approximately \$6,000.00 and \$17,000.00; that the company was established in 1989; and, it had gross sales of \$329,221.00 in 2001. 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. Counsel contends that the wages paid the beneficiary and the cash on hand in its bank account evidence 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. Evidence was submitted to show that the petitioner employed the beneficiary since February 1999. In 2001, 2002 and 2003, the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$39,318.82, \$37,173.00 and \$35,651.16 respectively.

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

¹ It has been approximately five years since the Alien Employment Application has been accepted and the proffered wage established. According to the employer certification that is part of the application, ETA Form 750 Part A, Section 23 b., states "The wage offered equals or exceeds the prevailing wage and I [the employer] guarantee that, if a labor certification is granted, the wage paid to the alien when the alien begins work will equal or exceed the prevailing wage which is applicable at the time the alien begins work."

petitioner's gross income. *Supra* at 1084. The court specifically rejected the argument that CIS should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. Finally, 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 tax return demonstrated the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$57,907.20 per year from the priority date of April 10, 2001:

- In 2001, the Form 1120S stated a taxable income loss² of <\$14,053.00>³.

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, CIS will review the petitioner's assets.

- In 2001, the Form 1120S stated taxable income loss of <\$14,053.00>. In 2001 the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$39,318.82. The proffered wage is \$57,907.20 per year. The sum of the taxable income loss and the wages paid is less than the proffered wage.

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. Also, in the subject case the petitioner has not paid the beneficiary the proffered wage in tax years 2001, 2002 and 2003.

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 2000 through 2001 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.⁴ 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.

² IRS Form 1120S, Line 21.

³ The symbols <a number> indicate a negative number, or in the context of a tax return or other financial statement, a loss, that is below zero.

⁴ 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.

Examining the Form 1120S U.S. Income Tax Return submitted by the petitioner, Schedule L found in that return indicates the following:

- In 2001, petitioner's Form 1120S return stated current assets of \$237.00 and \$10,754.00 in current liabilities. Therefore, the petitioner had <\$10,517.00> in net current assets. Since the proffered wage is \$57,907.20 per year, this sum is less than the proffered wage.

Therefore, 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 explanatory accompanying the appeal that there are other ways to determine the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date. According to regulation,⁵ copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements are the means by which petitioner's ability to pay is determined.

Counsel contends that the wages paid the beneficiary and the cash on hand in its bank account evidence the ability to pay the proffered wage. Correlating the amounts stated in counsel's contention with the petitioner's tax return, it is clear that counsel is combining petitioner's taxable income loss with the cash also received by the business for that year as stated on Schedule "L" as current assets. CIS will consider separately the taxable income and the net current assets of a business to determine the ability of a petitioner to pay the proffered wage on the priority date. According to Schedule L, the petitioner had <\$10,517.00> in net current assets. Further to do otherwise would duplicate the petitioner's finances and misstate its financial position.

Counsel advocates the use of the cash balance of the business account to show the ability to pay the proffered wage. 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.

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

Counsel also asserts that possible future regulatory provisions would affect the case in the petitioner's favor. We must adjudicate the case according to the regulations as are currently in affect. Counsel's contentions cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the corporate tax return as submitted by petitioner that shows that the petitioner has not demonstrated its ability to 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.

⁵ 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

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.