

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6

18 2007

FILE:

[REDACTED]  
SRC 06 255 51549

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

IN RE:

Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

[REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

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, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a foreign food specialty cook. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor, 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 beginning on the priority date of the visa petition and 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 this decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's original October 16, 2006, the single 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 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, 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. 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 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 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 CFR § 204.5(d). The priority date in the instant petition is March 1, 2004. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$2,500 per month or \$30,000 annually.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a de novo basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's de novo authority has been long recognized by the

federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal<sup>1</sup>. Relevant evidence submitted on appeal includes counsel's brief, an affidavit, dated November 13, 2006, from one of the petitioner's owners, and a copy of the petitioner's 2003 Form 1120S, U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation. Other relevant evidence includes copies of the petitioner's 2004 and 2005 Forms 1120S, a copy of a compiled income statement for the period January 1, 2006 through August 31, 2006, copies of the petitioner's 2004 and 2005 Forms W-3, Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statements, and copies of the 2004 and 2005 Forms W-2, Wage and Tax Statements, issued by the petitioner on behalf of its employees for those two years. The record does not contain any other evidence relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner's 2003 through 2005 Forms 1120S reflect ordinary incomes or net incomes from Schedule K of \$16,811, \$25,732, and \$16,781, respectively. The petitioner's 2003 through 2005 Forms also reflect net current assets of \$0, \$827, and \$2,399, respectively.

The petitioner's compiled income statement for the period ended August 31, 2006 reflects total revenue of \$231,224.85 and a net income of \$49,422.75.<sup>2</sup>

The petitioner's 2004 and 2005 Forms W-2 does not show that the petitioner employed the beneficiary during those years.

On appeal, counsel claims that the net income should be prorated as of the date of filing of the labor certification, that the beneficiary will replace his wife as cook, that the wages paid to his wife could be used to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage, and that due to the high turn-over of employees in the business, the hiring of the beneficiary will result in stability and will generate more income than what is paid for her services.

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). In evaluating whether a job offer is realistic, CIS requires the petitioner to demonstrate financial resources sufficient to pay the beneficiary's proffered wages, although the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> Counsel's reliance on unaudited financial records is misplaced. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) makes clear that where a petitioner relies on financial statements to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage, those financial statements must be audited. As there is no accountant's report accompanying these statements, the AAO cannot conclude that they are audited statements. Unaudited financial statements are the representations of management. The unsupported representations of management are not reliable evidence and are insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage. Therefore, the AAO will not consider the petitioner's compiled financial statement for the period ended August 31, 2006 when determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

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 September 15, 2003, the beneficiary does not claim the petitioner as a past or present employer. In addition, counsel has not submitted any Forms W-2 or Forms 1099-MISC, Miscellaneous Income, issued by the petitioner on behalf of the beneficiary, for the pertinent years (2004 and 2005). Therefore, the petitioner has not established that it employed the beneficiary in 2004 and 2005.

As an alternative 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, 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983). In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc.*, the court held that 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 CIS 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 also Elatos Restaurant Corp.*, 632 F. Supp. at 1054. *Chi-Feng Chang* further noted:

Plaintiffs also contend the depreciation amounts on the 1985 and 1986 returns are non-cash deductions. Plaintiffs thus request that the court *sua sponte* add back to net cash the depreciation expense charged for the year. Plaintiffs cite no legal authority for this proposition. This argument has likewise been presented before and rejected. *See Elatos*, 632 F. Supp. at 1054. [CIS] 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.

(Emphasis in original.) *Chi-Feng* at 537

Where an S corporation's income is exclusively from a trade or business, CIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner's Form 1120S. The instructions on the Form 1120S, U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation, state on page one, "Caution, Include only trade or business income and expenses on lines 1a through 21."

Where an S corporation has income from sources other than from a trade or business, net income is found on Schedule K. The Schedule K form related to the Form 1120 states that an S corporation's total income from its various sources are to be shown not on page one of the Form 1120S, but on lines 1 through 6 of the Schedule K, Shareholders' Shares of Income, Credits, Deductions, etc. *See Internal Revenue Service, Instructions for Form 1120S, 2003*, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-03/i1120s.pdf>, *Instructions for Form 1120S, 2002*, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-02/i1120s.pdf>, (accessed February 15, 2005).

In the instant case, the petitioner's 2003 through 2005 net incomes from Schedule K were \$16,811, \$25,732, and \$16,781, respectively. The petitioner could not have paid the proffered wage of \$30,000 from its net incomes in 2003 through 2005.<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless, the petitioner's net income is not the only statistic that can be used to demonstrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. 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. The petitioner's total assets include depreciable assets that the petitioner uses in its business. Those depreciable assets will not be converted to cash during the ordinary course of business and will 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, 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 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 out of those net current assets. The petitioner's net current assets in 2004 and 2005 were \$827, and \$2,399, respectively. The petitioner could not have paid the proffered wage of \$30,000 from its net current assets in 2004 and 2005.

On appeal, counsel contends that the net income should be prorated as of the date of filing of the labor certification, that the beneficiary will replace his wife as cook, that the wages paid to his wife could be used to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage, and that due to the high turn-over of employees in the business, the hiring of the beneficiary will result in stability and will generate more income than what is paid for her services.

Counsel requests that CIS prorate the proffered wage for the portion of the year that occurred after the priority date. We will not, however, consider 12 months of income towards an ability to pay a lesser period of the proffered wage any more than we would consider 24 months of income towards paying the annual proffered wage. While CIS will prorate the proffered wage if the record contains evidence of net income or payment of the beneficiary's wages specifically covering the portion of the year that occurred after the priority date (and only that period), such as monthly income statements or pay stubs, the petitioner has not submitted such evidence.

---

<sup>3</sup> Please note that the petitioner's tax returns for 2003 were for the year before the priority date of March 1, 2004, and, therefore, have little evidentiary value when determining the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage of \$30,000 from the priority date. Therefore, the AAO will not consider the petitioner's 2003 tax return except when determining the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning business.

<sup>4</sup> According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3<sup>rd</sup> 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.

Counsel claims that the hiring of the beneficiary will result in stability and will generate more income than what is paid for her services. However, against the projection of future earnings, *Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977) states:

I do not feel, nor do I believe the Congress intended, that the petitioner, who admittedly could not pay the offered wage at the time the petition was filed, should subsequently become eligible to have the petition approved under a new set of facts hinged upon probability and projections, even beyond the information presented on appeal.

Therefore, the AAO will not consider the probability of income generated by the beneficiary as proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

On appeal, counsel alleges that the beneficiary will replace his wife as cook and that the wages paid to his wife could be used to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage. In the instant case, the evidence in the record names the petitioner's wife, contains competent evidence of the wages paid and fulltime employment of the petitioner's wife, verifies that her duties are those of the proffered position as set forth on the ETA 750, and contains evidence that the petitioner has replaced or will replace her with the beneficiary. In the case where the petitioner has established that the beneficiary will be replacing another worker performing the duties of the proffered position, the wages already paid to that employee may be shown to be 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. In this case, the 2004 Forms W-2, issued by the petitioner on behalf of his wife, [REDACTED] reveals that the petitioner compensated [REDACTED] in 2004 and [REDACTED]. When the wages paid to [REDACTED] are added to the petitioner's net income in 2004 and 2005, the resulting total is more than sufficient to pay the proffered wage [REDACTED] (2004: [REDACTED] net income from Schedule [REDACTED] wages paid to [REDACTED] more than the proffered wage of \$30,000; 2005: \$16,781 net income from [REDACTED] more than the proffered wage of \$30,000).

In examining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, the fundamental focus of the CIS' determination is whether the employer is making a realistic job offer and has the overall financial ability to satisfy the proffered wage. *Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 145 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977). Accordingly, after a review of the petitioner's federal tax returns and all other relevant evidence, we conclude that the petitioner has established that it had the ability to pay the salary offered as of the priority date of the petition and continuing to present.

For the reasons discussed above, the assertions of counsel on appeal and the evidence submitted on appeal 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 been met.

---

<sup>5</sup> It is noted that the petitioner's Forms W-2 show [REDACTED]. However, the social security number for [REDACTED] Shareholder's Share of Income, Deductions, Credits, etc. and the 2005 Form 1040, U.S. Individual Income Tax Return. Therefore, the AAO accepts [REDACTED] as being the same person.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained. The director's decision of October 16, 2006 is withdrawn. The petition is approved.