

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6

File: [REDACTED] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 22 2009
SRC 06 161 50107

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom
Acting 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 dismissed.

The petitioner operates a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cook. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750 Application for Alien Employment Certification certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). 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.

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

As set forth in the director's denial dated April 9, 2007, 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 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.

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 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 Form ETA 750 Application for Alien 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 Form ETA 750 was accepted on April 26, 2001.¹ The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$11.87 per hour (\$24,689.60 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires that the employee have two years of experience in the proffered position, that the employee be available for overtime and weekend work, and that the employee provide references.

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.²

Relevant evidence in the record includes copies of the following documents: the original Form ETA 750 Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the DOL; [REDACTED]'s U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Form 1120 tax returns for 2001 to 2004³; the beneficiary's IRS Form

¹ It has been approximately eight years since the Application for Alien Employment Certification has been accepted and the proffered wage established. According to the employer certification that is part of the application, Form ETA 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." However, the petitioner must show in accordance with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(a)(2) that it can pay the proffered wage from the time of the priority date.

² The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) 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).

³ The AAO notes that the petitioner has submitted the IRS Form 1120 tax returns for 2001 to 2004 for [REDACTED], which is located at a different address and is the apparent owner of the petitioner's business. While the petitioner's bank statements reflected that [REDACTED] does business as [REDACTED], the record of proceeding does not contain a doing business as or fictitious name certificate. A search of the Commonwealth of Virginia's State Corporate Commission's online public inquiry database does not reflect that [REDACTED] has filed a fictitious name certification. Commonwealth of Virginia's State Corporate Commission Georgia Secretary of State, *available at* http://s0302.vita.virginia.gov/servlet/resqportal/resqportal?&rq_custom_dir=sccisp1 (last visited April 9, 2009). For purposes of today's decision, the AAO will consider evidence from Strands, Inc.; however, if this matter is pursued, evidence must be submitted to establish that Strands, Inc. is the owner and operator of the petitioning business. Otherwise, because a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders, the assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability

W-2 Wage and Tax Statements for 2001 to 2005 issued by [REDACTED] in the amounts of \$16,652.21, \$15,021.39, \$13,700.00, \$14,900.00, and \$17,700.00 respectively; bank statements from [REDACTED] doing business as the petitioner for 2003, 2005, and 2006⁴; assurance letters from the petitioning company's owner dated April 6, 2006 and May 1, 2007 stating that the company has the ability to pay the proffered wage; and documentation concerning the beneficiary's qualifications.

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a C corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1989 and to currently employ 28 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the fiscal year is based on a calendar year. The net annual income and gross annual income stated on the petition were \$380,000.00 and \$700,000.00 respectively. On the Form ETA 750, signed by the beneficiary on April 23, 2001, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner since May of 2000.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of a Form ETA 750 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the Form 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, USCIS requires the petitioner to demonstrate financial resources sufficient to pay the beneficiary's proffered 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 (BIA 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner 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

to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980). In a similar case, the court in *Sitar v. Ashcroft*, 2003 WL 22203713 (D.Mass. Sept. 18, 2003) stated, "nothing in the governing regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 204.5, permits [USCIS] to consider the financial resources of individuals or entities who have no legal obligation to pay the wage."

⁴ Counsel's reliance on the balances in the petitioner's bank accounts 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 petitioner's taxable income (income minus deductions) or the cash specified on Schedule L that will be considered below in determining the petitioner's net current assets.

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 petitioner has not established that it paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date.

Counsel submitted the beneficiary's IRS Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statements for 2001 to 2005 issued by [REDACTED] in the amounts of \$16,652.21, \$15,021.39, \$13,700.00, \$14,900.00, and \$17,700.00 respectively.⁵ In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date as noted above. Since the proffered wage is \$24,689.60 per year, the petitioner must establish that it can pay the beneficiary the difference between wages actually paid and the proffered wage, which is \$8,037.39, \$9,668.21, \$10,989.60, \$9,789.60, and \$6,989.60 from 2001 to 2005 respectively.

If the petitioner does not establish that it 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. 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 that exceeded the proffered wage 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.

Strands, Inc.'s tax returns demonstrate the following financial information concerning the petitioner's ability to pay:

- In 2001, the IRS Form 1120 stated net income of \$24,288.00.⁶
- In 2002, the IRS Form 1120 stated net income of \$31,410.00.
- In 2003, the IRS Form 1120 stated net income of -\$5,951.00.
- In 2004, the IRS Form 1120 stated net income of -\$11,193.00.⁷

The petitioner did not demonstrate that [REDACTED] had sufficient net income to pay the difference between wages actually paid and the proffered wage for 2003 to 2005.

⁵ The AAO notes that future proceedings would need to verify that [REDACTED] is the petitioner. *Supra* n. 3.

⁶ The AAO notes that net income is listed on line 28 of the IRS Form 1120.

⁷ The AAO notes that the petitioner submitted evidence that it sought an extension to file its IRS Form 1120 for 2005.

If the net income the petitioner demonstrates it had available during the 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, USCIS 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, USCIS 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.⁸ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6, of the IRS Form 1120 and include cash-on-hand. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If the total of a corporation's end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets.

- [REDACTED]'s net current assets during 2003 were -\$4,717.00.
- [REDACTED]'s net current assets during 2004 were -\$11,605.00.⁹

Based on Strands, Inc.'s net current assets, the petitioner cannot demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage for 2003 to 2005 even if net current assets are combined with wages paid to the beneficiary.

Therefore, for the period for which tax returns were submitted, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.

Accordingly, from the priority date or when the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL, the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, its net income, or its net current assets except for tax years 2001 to 2002.

The AAO notes that the petitioner has filed two Form I-140 petitions with USCIS, including that for the beneficiary, since 2001. The petitioner has not established by evidence that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage for each I-140 beneficiary from the priority date until each beneficiary obtains permanent residence. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).¹⁰

⁸ 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.

⁹ The AAO notes that the petitioner did not submit an IRS Form 1120 for 2005 on appeal.

¹⁰ Further, the petitioner would be obligated to pay the beneficiary of each petition the

On appeal, counsel asserts that the beneficiary's IRS Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statements and the petitioner's bank statements demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Counsel claims that the petitioner has maintained steady operational activity and that the petitioner may continue to increase its business and profits if the petition is approved.¹¹ Counsel cites *Matter of Sonegawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (BIA 1967), and an unpublished decision cited by counsel as "*Matter of _____*, VSC, EAC 01-018-50413 (AAO Jan. 31, 2003) 8 No. 18 Bender's Immigration Bulletin 1528-29 (Sept. 15, 2003)."¹²

Sonegawa relates to petitions filed during uncharacteristically unprofitable or difficult years but only in a framework of profitable or successful years. The petitioning entity in *Sonegawa* 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 *Sonegawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere.

No unusual circumstances have been shown to exist in this case to parallel those in *Sonegawa*, nor has it been established that 2001 to 2005 were uncharacteristically unprofitable years for the petitioner. Furthermore, counsel has asserted that the petitioner's company has maintained steady operational activity.

Counsel argues that consideration of the beneficiary's potential to increase the petitioner's revenues is appropriate and establishes with even greater certainty that the petitioner has more than adequate ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner has not, however, provided any standard or criterion for the evaluation of such earnings. For example, the petitioner has not demonstrated that

prevailing wage in accordance with DOL regulations.

¹¹ The AAO notes that the assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

¹² While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions of USCIS are binding on all its employees in the administration of the Act, unpublished decisions are not similarly binding. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a).

the beneficiary will replace less productive workers or that the beneficiary has a reputation that would increase the number of customers.

The evidence submitted fails to establish that the petitioner has the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have the education and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's filing date, which is November 5, 2003. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). A petitioner must establish the elements for the approval of the petition at the time of filing. A petition may not be approved if the beneficiary was not qualified at the priority date, but expects to become eligible at a subsequent time. *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm. 1971).

To determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for an employment based immigrant visa, USCIS must examine whether the alien's credentials meet the requirements set forth in the labor certification. USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant*, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm. 1986). *See also, Mandany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008, (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the proffered position, that the employee be available for overtime and weekend work, and that the employee provide references. Counsel has submitted a letter from [REDACTED], the owner of Restaurant "[REDACTED]" in Trinidad, Beni, dated June 1, 1996 stating that the beneficiary worked as a cook from December 1993 to May of 1996.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3) provides:

(ii) *Other documentation*—

(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 AAO finds the letter not to constitute sufficient evidence of the beneficiary's two years of experience in the proffered position. This letter fails to provide the address of the employer as required by 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(A) and therefore is not acceptable evidence.

The director did not note that this evidence was missing within her April 9, 2007 decision letter. An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 299 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a de novo basis).

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. 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.