

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:

SRC 07 129 53626

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUN 23 2009

IN RE:

Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

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 (director), and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner states that it is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a "cook – Italian style." 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), approved 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 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.

As set forth in the director's October 30, 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.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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 regulation 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 labor certification was accepted for processing by 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 the labor certification. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

Here, the labor certification was filed with the DOL on June 17, 2002. The proffered wage stated on the labor certification is \$18.89 per hour (\$34,379.80 per year, based on a 35 hour week). The labor certification states that the position requires an individual with two years experience in the job offered.

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.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is an S corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1986 and to employ 15 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the labor certification, signed by the beneficiary on May 9, 2002, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

Evidence in the record of proceeding includes Forms 1120S, U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation, for 2002 through 2005; an unaudited financial statement for the period ending August 31, 2007; and a letter stating that the beneficiary was employed abroad as a cook of Italian style food from May 1, 1998 through March 15, 2001.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of a labor certification application establishes a priority date for the petition based on it, 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, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary during the required 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. If the petitioner has not paid the beneficiary wages that are at least equal to the proffered wage for the required period, the petitioner is obligated to establish that it could pay the difference between the wages actually paid to the beneficiary, if any, and the \$34,379.80 proffered wage.

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 during the required period, USCIS will next examine the

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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).

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. 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. The court in *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. [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.

(Emphasis in original.) *Chi-Feng Chang*, 719 F. Supp. at 537.

The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for the required period, as shown in the table below.<sup>2</sup>

<u>Year</u>	<u>Net Income (\$)</u>
2002	-71,356.00
2003	-66,477.00
2004	-51,284.00
2005	-34,515.00

---

<sup>2</sup>For an S corporation, ordinary income (loss) from trade or business activities is reported on Line 21 of Form 1120S, and income/loss reconciliation is reported on Schedule K, Line 18 (2006 to present), Line 17e (2004 and 2005) or Line 23 (1997 to 2003). When the two numbers differ, the number reported on Schedule K is used for net income. In the instant case, for 2002 and 2003, the director incorrectly used the figure on Line 21 instead of Schedule K, Line 23.

Therefore, for the years 2002 through 2005, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay 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.<sup>3</sup> 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.

The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net current assets for the required period, as shown in the table below.<sup>4</sup>

<u>Year</u>	<u>Net Current Assets (\$)</u>
2002	1,876.00
2003	9,203.00
2004	-7,219.00
2005	-59,790.00

For the years 2002 through 2005, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay 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.

---

<sup>3</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 accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

<sup>4</sup>On Form 1120S, USCIS considers current assets to be the sum of Lines 1 through 6 on Schedule L, and current liabilities to be the sum of Lines 16 through 18.

Counsel asserts in his brief accompanying the appeal that there is another way to determine the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date. On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner paid wages of \$169,201 in 2002, \$212,049 in 2003, \$104,322 in 2004, and \$248,016. Counsel claims that these wages were comprised, in part, by part-time, temporary workers who will be replaced by the beneficiary. Counsel provides no supporting evidence of the amount of wages paid each year that were paid to part-time, temporary workers who will be replaced by the beneficiary, or that the petitioner would terminate these workers upon the beneficiary obtaining employment authorization. Without supporting documentary evidence, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The record also contains the petitioner's unaudited financial statements for the period ended August 31, 2007. 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.

Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax returns as submitted by the petitioner that demonstrates that the petitioner could not pay the proffered wage from the priority date.

In addition to the preceding analysis, USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's 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 15 employees. The petitioner's tax returns show gross sales of \$937,128.00 in 2002, \$876,881.00 in 2003, \$887,983.00 in 2004, and \$1,037,311.00 in 2005. 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 *Sonegawa*. 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. Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.<sup>5</sup>

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

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.

---

<sup>5</sup>In addition, the petitioner has filed a petition on behalf of another worker (EAC-05-030-50965). Therefore, the petitioner must establish that it had sufficient income to pay the wages of both beneficiaries from the applicable priority dates until the acquisition of permanent residence.