

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly warranted
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6




FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 10 2007
WAC 05 094 51961

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: 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 for

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is an Indian restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a specialty cook of South Indian food. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor, accompanied the petition.¹ 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 denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history of this case is documented in the record and is incorporated into this decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's June 20, 2005 decision denying the petition, the single issue in this case is whether the evidence establishes the petitioner's 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 or seasonal 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), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and who are members of the professions.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii), 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 unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states:

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. In a case where the prospective United States employer employs 100 or more workers, the director may accept a statement from a financial officer of the organization which establishes the prospective employer's ability to pay the proffered wage. In appropriate cases, additional

¹ The ETA 750 was issued to [REDACTED] c. The record contains a letter, dated August 29, 2003, from the petitioner's CFO, informing the DOL of a change of ownership of [REDACTED], and its new name: [REDACTED]. This attachment was approved by the DOL on May 7, 2004.

evidence, such as profit/loss statements, bank account records, or personnel records, may be submitted by the petitioner or requested by [Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)].

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the petition's priority date, which is the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The priority date in the instant petition is April 25, 2001.² The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$21,000 annually.

The AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis. *See Dor v. I.N.S.* 891 F.2d 997, 1002, n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including any new evidence properly submitted on appeal.

In the instant appeal, the petitioner submits a brief and additional evidence.

Relevant evidence submitted on appeal includes: the petitioner's quarterly federal tax returns for the last two quarters of 2004 and the first two quarters of 2005; the petitioner's tax returns from the State of California for the last three quarters of 2004 and for the first quarter of 2005; unaudited financial statements for 2003 and 2004; and the petitioner's federal income tax returns for 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004.

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).

On appeal, counsel states that the submitted documentation clearly establishes the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

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). For each year at issue, the petitioner's financial resources generally must be sufficient to pay the annual amount of the beneficiary's 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, CIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed the beneficiary at the time the priority date was established. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, this evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. In the instant case, on the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on January 12, 2005, the beneficiary claimed

² The instant beneficiary is being substituted for the initial recipient of the certified alien labor certification application. An I-140 petition for a substituted beneficiary retains the same priority date as the original ETA-750. Memo. from Luis G. Crocetti, Associate Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, to Regional Directors, *et al.*, Immigration and Naturalization Service, *Substitution of Labor Certification Beneficiaries*, at 3, http://ows.doleta.gov/dmstree/fm/fm96/fm_28-96a.pdf (March 7, 1996).

to have worked for the petitioner beginning in February 2002 and continuing through the date of the ETA 750B. The record, however, contains no evidence indicating the amount of any compensation paid by the petitioner to the beneficiary.

As another means of determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, CIS will next examine the petitioner's net income figure as reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return for a given year, 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. Tex. 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.*, the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now CIS, 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. 623 F. Supp. at 1084. The court specifically rejected the argument that the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. Finally, there is no precedent that would allow the petitioner to "add back to net cash the depreciation expense charged for the year." See *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Tex. 1989); see also *Elatos Restaurant Corp.*, 632 F. Supp. at 1054.

The evidence indicates that the petitioner is a corporation. The record contains copies of the petitioner's Form 1120 U.S. Corporation Income Tax Returns for 2002, 2003, and 2004 and forms 1120 for [redacted] for 2001 and 2002. The record before the director closed on May 27, 2005 with the receipt by the director of the petitioner's submissions in response to the request for evidence. The petitioner's tax return for 2004 is the most recent return provided by the petitioner.

For a C corporation, CIS considers net income to be the figure shown on line 28, taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions, of the Form 1120 U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return, or the equivalent figure on line 24 of the Form 1120-A U.S. Corporation Short Form Tax Return.

The petitioner's tax returns state amounts for taxable income on line 28 as shown in the table below.

Tax year	Net income or (loss)	Wage increase needed to pay the proffered wage	Surplus or (deficit)
2002	-\$2,507.00	\$23,507.00*	-\$23,507.00
2003	\$5,756.00	\$15,244.00*	-\$15,244.00
2004	\$1,438.00	\$19,562.00*	-\$19,562.00

* The full proffered wage, since the record contains no evidence of any wage payments made by the petitioner to the beneficiary in those years.

The tax returns for [redacted] state amounts for taxable income on line 28 as shown in the table below.

Tax year	Net income or (loss)	Wage increase needed to pay the proffered wage	Surplus or (deficit)
2001	\$56,217.00	0*	\$35,217.00
2002	\$37,747.00	0*	\$16,747.00

* The full proffered wage, since the record contains no evidence of any wage payments made by the petitioner to the beneficiary in those years.

The above information is insufficient to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage in 2003 and 2004.

As an alternative means of determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wages, CIS may review the petitioner's net current assets. Net current assets are a corporate taxpayer's current assets less its current liabilities. Current assets include cash on hand, inventories, and receivables expected to be converted to cash within one year. A corporation's current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If a corporation's net current assets are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage out of those net current assets. The net current assets are expected to be converted to cash as the proffered wage becomes due. Thus, the difference between current assets and current liabilities is the net current assets figure, which if greater than the proffered wage, evidences the petitioner's ability to pay.

Calculations based on the Schedule L's attached to the petitioner's tax returns yield the amounts for year-end net current assets as shown in the following table.

Tax year	Net current assets	Wage increase needed to pay the proffered wage	Surplus or (deficit)
2003	\$16,574.00	\$4,426.00*	-\$4,426.00
2004	\$7,763.00	\$13,237.00*	-\$13,237.00

* The full proffered wage, since the record contains no evidence of any wage payments made by the petitioner to the beneficiary in those years.

Counsel's assertion that the petitioner's tax returns may reflect lower net incomes that are calculated on a cash basis, is noted. Although tax returns prepared pursuant to cash basis accounting may not facilitate comparing various years to each other, they are at least as good an indicator of the funds that were available to the petitioner during a given year.

The above information is insufficient to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage in 2003 and 2004.

On appeal, counsel submitted the petitioner's unaudited financial statements for 2003 and 2004. Counsel's reliance on unaudited financial records is misplaced. Unaudited financial statements 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 of its 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. Further, CIS may not "pierce the corporate veil" and look to the assets of the corporation's owner to satisfy the corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. It is an elementary rule that a corporation 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 the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The record contains no other evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial situation.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the evidence in the record fails to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence.

The decision of the director to deny the petition was correct, based on the evidence in the record before the director.³

For the reasons discussed above, the assertions of counsel on appeal and the evidence submitted on appeal fail to overcome the decision of the director.

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.

³ It is additionally noted that a search of the California Secretary of State's California Business Search website at <http://kepler.ss.ca.gov/corpdata/ShowList> finds that Globesync Technology, Inc.'s status as a corporation has been suspended.