

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]
LIN 07 038 52276

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JUN 25 2009

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:

[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.

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 or reopen, 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, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a construction company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a carpenter. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States 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 and 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.

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 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 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 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 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 25, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$18.00 per hour (\$37,440.00 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of 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) ("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.¹ On appeal, counsel submits a brief, a copy of the petitioner's Form 1120S U.S Corporation Income Tax Return for the year 2006, and copies of previously submitted evidence. Other evidence in the record includes copies of the petitioner's Forms 1120S for the years 2001 through 2005; copies of the Forms W-2 Wage and Tax Statement issued by the petitioner to the beneficiary for the years 2001 and 2006; and copies of pay stubs issued to the beneficiary in November and December 2007.

The record shows that the petitioner is structured as an S corporation. On the I-140 petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1989 and to currently have 8 employees. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on April 7, 2001, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

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, 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 during a given period, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed and 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 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 record shows that the petitioner paid the beneficiary as follows in the years 2001 through 2006:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Wages Paid</u>
2001	\$23,290.00
2002	\$25,201.00
2003	\$25,899.00
2004	\$19,465.00
2005	\$23,086.00

¹ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations 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).

2006 \$23,775.00

The petitioner has not established that it paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from 2001 to 2006. The petitioner must establish that it had the ability to pay the beneficiary the difference between the proffered wage and the wages actually paid during these years. Specifically, the petitioner must establish that it had the ability to pay the following amount:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Difference Between Proffered Wage and Wages Actually Paid</u>
2001	\$14,150.00
2002	\$12,239.00
2003	\$11,541.00
2004	\$17,975.00
2005	\$14,354.00
2006	\$13,665.00

If the petitioner does not establish that it employed and 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. *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., 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 receipts and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner’s gross receipts 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 Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 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 USCIS 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* at 537.

The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for the years 2001 through 2006, as shown in the table below.²

- In 2001, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$52,304.00
- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$25,174.00
- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$45,647.00
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$40,869.00
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net income of -\$23,970.00
- In 2006, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$65,536.00

The petitioner had sufficient net income to pay the difference between the proffered wage and the wages actually paid in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2006. The petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the difference between the proffered wage and wages actually paid in 2005.

As an alternate means of determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS may review the petitioner's net current assets. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.³ 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 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 return for 2005 demonstrate that it's net current assets at the end of the tax year were -\$31,139.00. The petitioner has not established that it had sufficient net current assets to pay the difference between the proffered wage and wages actually paid in 2005.

The petitioner has not established that it had the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage in 2005 through wages paid to the beneficiary, net income or net current assets.

On appeal, counsel asserts that there is another way to determine the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Specifically, counsel notes that the petitioner had \$104,229.00 in "other

² Where an S corporation's income is exclusively from a trade or business, USCIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner's IRS Form 1120S. However, where an S corporation has income, credits, deductions or other adjustments from sources other than a trade or business, they are reported on Schedule K. If the Schedule K has relevant entries for additional income, credits, deductions or other adjustments, net income is found on line 23 (on income tax returns for the years 1997 through 2003), line 17e (on returns for the years 2004 and 2005) or line 18 (on returns for the years 2006 through 2008) of Schedule K. See Instructions for Form 1120S, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (accessed June 17, 2009) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholder's shares of the corporation's income, deductions, credits, etc.).

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

deductions” listed on its 2005 tax return. Counsel states that these deductions are a “depreciation item” which did not reduce the petitioner’s cash position. This is incorrect – “other deductions” is listed on line 19 of the Form 1120S and it is separate from depreciation, which is listed on line 14 of the Form 1120S. “Other deductions” includes various costs of doing business. On the petitioner’s 2005 tax return, “other deductions” included auto expenses, telephone, fuel, utilities, travel, meals and entertainment. These are real expenses which would reduce a company’s cash position. By contrast, depreciation is a measure of the decline in the value of a business asset over time. See Internal Revenue Service, *Instructions for Form 4562, Depreciation and Amortization (Including Information on Listed Property)* (2004), at 1-2, available at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i4562.pdf>. In any event, as noted above, courts have already rejected the argument that depreciation should be added back to net income in determining a petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage. See, e.g., *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. at 537. Thus, even if the petitioner had listed depreciation on its 2005 tax return, such amount would not be added back in determining the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage.

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.

The petitioner was incorporated in 1989 and currently has eight employees. The petitioner’s gross income averaged more than \$900,000 per year from 2001 to 2006. The costs of labor and/or salaries and wages listed on the petitioner’s tax returns averaged over \$175,000 per year from 2001 to 2006. Although USCIS will not consider gross income without also considering the expenses that were incurred to generate that income, the overall magnitude of the entity’s business activities should be considered when the entity’s ability to pay is marginal or borderline. See *Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612. Thus, assessing the totality of circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the petitioner has failed to establish that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage. There is no

evidence in the record of the petitioner's reputation, whether there were uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses during 2005, or whether the beneficiary would be replacing a former employee or outsourced service.

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.