

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: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: AUG 10 2009
LIN 06 275 52096

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 Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner claims to be a manufacturer of wallpaper. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a color matcher. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3). As required by 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3), the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the Department of Labor (DOL).

As set forth in the director's August 24, 2007 denial, the primary 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. The AAO will also consider whether the petitioner has established that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the offered position.¹

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director failed to properly review the financial information submitted with the petition.

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 the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b); *see also Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp.*, 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

The evidence in the record of proceeding includes the following:

- Beneficiary's Forms 1040, U.S. Individual Income Tax Return, for 2001 through 2004.
- Beneficiary's Forms 1040X, Amended U.S. Individual Income Tax Return, for 2001 and 2002.

¹An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the director does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003).

²The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by 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).

- Forms W-2, Wage and Tax Statement, issued by the petitioner to an individual named [REDACTED] for the years 2003 and 2004.
- Chart titled "P&L Analysis for FY2001 through FY2006."
- A letter from the petitioner's controller stating the attached P&L chart "was supplied by [the petitioner] for inclusion into [its] respective corporate owners' [audited] financial statements."
- 2002 Annual Report of the petitioner's parent company, Falcon Products, Inc.
- Experience letter stating that the beneficiary was employed as a color/tint mixer from February 3, 1992 to December 28, 1995.

On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1986 and to employ 70 workers. The priority date of the instant petition is August 31, 2001, the date the labor certification was filed with the DOL. The proffered wage stated on the labor certification is \$16.16 per hour (\$33,612.80 per year). The labor certification states that the position requires two years of experience in the job offered. On the labor certification, signed by the beneficiary on November 4, 2003, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner as a color matcher since March 2001.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), grants preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable 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 petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. 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). The regulation 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.

The petitioner must also establish that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on the labor certification. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) will first examine whether the petitioner employed beneficiary during the required period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it paid the beneficiary 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. If the petitioner has not paid the beneficiary wages that are at least equal

to the proffered wage for the required period, the petitioner must establish that it could pay the difference between the wages actually paid to the beneficiary, if any, and the proffered wage.

The petitioner has not submitted sufficient evidence to establish that it has employed the beneficiary. The record contains Forms W-2 for 2003 and 2004 issued by the petitioner to an individual with the name [REDACTED]. In addition, the employee's social security number listed on the Forms W-2 is different than the social security number listed for the beneficiary on his tax returns. Since the Forms W-2 have a name and social security number that differ from the beneficiary's name and social security number, it cannot be concluded that the Forms W-2 relate to the beneficiary. In addition, the beneficiary's tax returns for 2001 through 2004 only state the total amount of wages earned, not the name(s) of the beneficiary's employer(s).

If, as in this case, the petitioner does not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage each year during the required 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. *River Street Donuts, LLC v. Napolitano*, 558 F.3d 111 (1st Cir. 2009). 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. 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 wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross sales exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

In *K.C.P. Food*, 623 F. Supp. at 1084, the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now USCIS, 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. The court specifically rejected the argument that the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income.

With respect to depreciation, the court in *River Street Donuts* noted:

The AAO recognized that a depreciation deduction is a systematic allocation of the cost of a tangible long-term asset and does not represent a specific cash expenditure during the year claimed. Furthermore, the AAO indicated that the allocation of the depreciation of a long-term asset could be spread out over the years or concentrated into a few depending on the petitioner's choice of accounting and depreciation methods. Nonetheless, the AAO explained that depreciation represents an actual cost of doing business, which could represent either the diminution in value of buildings and equipment or the accumulation of funds necessary to replace perishable equipment and buildings. Accordingly, the AAO stressed that even though amounts deducted for depreciation do not

represent current use of cash, neither does it represent amounts available to pay wages.

We find that the AAO has a rational explanation for its policy of not adding depreciation back to net income. Namely, that the amount spent on a long term tangible asset is a "real" expense.

River Street Donuts at 116. “[USCIS] 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.” *Chi-Feng Chang* at 537 (emphasis added).

The petitioner has not submitted any federal tax returns, annual reports or audited financial statements.³ The director's May 23, 2007 request for evidence (RFE) instructed the petitioner to provide evidence of its financial ability to pay the proffered offered wage from 2001 through 2006 in the form of federal tax returns, annual reports or audited financial statements. The petitioner filed its response to the RFE on July 2, 2007. The response contained a chart titled "P&L Analysis for FY2001 through FY2006" together with a letter from the petitioner's controller stating that "the attached financial information was supplied by [the petitioner] for inclusion into our respective corporate owners' [audited] financial statements." This does not constitute an audited financial statement.

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. An audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards to obtain a reasonable assurance that the financial statements of the business are free of material misstatements. The unsupported representations of management are not reliable evidence and are insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage. The regulation 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) also states that evidence of ability to pay "*shall* be in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements." (Emphasis added.).

In addition, even though the director denied the instant petition based on the petitioner's failure to provide the financial information required by 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), the petitioner still did not

³The record contains the 2002 Annual Report of the petitioner's parent company, Falcon Products, Inc. Because a parent corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its subsidiary, the assets of a parent corporation cannot be considered in determining the subsidiary petitioning corporation’s ability 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.”

submit it on appeal.

The petitioner's failure to provide this evidence is, by itself, sufficient cause to dismiss this appeal. While additional evidence may be submitted to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, it may not be substituted for evidence required by regulation. Failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). 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. at 165.

Therefore, for the years 2001 through 2006, the petitioner did not establish that it had sufficient net income to pay the difference between the wage paid, if any, and the 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, USCIS will review the petitioner's assets. The petitioner's total assets are not considered in the determination of the ability to pay the proffered wage. 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.⁴ 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.

Since the petitioner did not submit the requested tax returns, annual reports or audited financial statements, the petitioner did not establish that it had sufficient net current assets to pay the difference between the wage paid, if any, and the proffered wage.

Therefore, the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets.

In addition to the preceding analysis, USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's

⁴According 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 accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

business activities in its determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612. The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* 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 *Sonogawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonogawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of a petitioner's net income and net current assets. USCIS may consider such factors as the number of years the petitioner has been doing business, the established historical growth of the petitioner's business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry, whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service, or any other evidence that USCIS deems relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In the instant case, the petitioner claims to have been in business since 1986 and to employ 70 employees. This, by itself, is not sufficient to demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner has not established the existence of any unusual circumstances to parallel those in *Sonogawa*. There is no evidence in the record of the historical growth of the petitioner's business or the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses. There is no evidence of the petitioner's reputation within its industry. There is no evidence of whether the beneficiary will be replacing a former employee or an outsourced service.

Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this case, it is concluded that the evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has also not established that the beneficiary is qualified for the offered position. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act 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. While no degree is required for this classification, 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3)(ii)(B) provides that a petition for an alien in this classification must be accompanied by evidence that the beneficiary "meets the education, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification."

In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, 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. Iwine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coorney*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981). To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the priority date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. at 159; *see also Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I. & N. Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

In the instant case, the submitted labor certification states that the offered position requires an individual with two years experience in the job offered of color matcher. The record contains a letter claiming that the beneficiary was employed abroad as a color/tint mixer from February 3, 1992 to December 28, 1995. The title of the beneficiary's prior position differs from the title of color matcher listed on the labor certification. Further, the experience letter does not list any of the duties of the position that the beneficiary performed as a color/tint mixer. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. 204.5(a)(g) states:

Evidence relating to qualifying experience or training shall be in the form of letter(s) from current or former employer(s) or trainer(s) and shall include the name, address, and title of the writer, and *a specific description of the duties performed by the alien* or of the training received.

(Emphasis added). It is not possible to determine from the submitted experience letter whether the beneficiary's prior experience as a color/tint mixer is in the same occupation as a color matcher. The submitted letter is not sufficient to establish that the beneficiary has two year of experience in the job offered. Therefore, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary possesses the qualifications required to perform the proffered position. 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)).⁵

When the AAO denies a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge only if it is shown that the AAO abused its discretion with respect to all of the AAO's enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003).

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

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8

⁵It is also noted that the offered position stated on the petition has a different title and offered wage than the labor certification. Therefore, it is not clear whether the position on the petition is the same as the job offered set forth on the labor certification.

U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.