

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]
SRC 07 210 51598


Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

NOV 24 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:



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.

Perry Rhew
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 petition will be approved.

The petitioner operates a business and language training company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an instructor. 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 demonstrates 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 December 19, 2008, 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)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), provides for granting preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

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 November 19, 2001 and certified on April 24, 2007. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$27,645.00 per year. The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires a bachelor's degree in communications, a New York State registered business school teacher's license, and fluency in English and Spanish.

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

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; the petitioner's U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Form 990 tax returns for 2001 to 2005; the beneficiary's IRS Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statement for 2007 issued by the petitioner in the amount of \$22,043.75; audited financial statements regarding the financial status of the petitioner's company for 2000 to 2007; checks and pay stubs made out to the beneficiary by the petitioner for work performed in 2007²; and documentation concerning the beneficiary's qualifications.

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as an organization that is exempt from income tax. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1955 and to employ 43 workers currently. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year begins August 1st and ends July 31st. The petitioner did not list its net annual income or gross annual income on the petition. On the Form ETA 750, signed by the beneficiary on November 2, 2001, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner since October 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). USCIS requires the petitioner to demonstrate financial resources sufficient to pay the beneficiary's proffered wages, although the

¹ 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).

² The AAO notes that these checks constitute insufficient evidence of wages paid, because there is no evidence that they were cashed and processed by a bank.

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, 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 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 Statement for 2007 issued by the petitioner in the amount of \$22,043.75. 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 \$27,645.00 per year, the petitioner must establish that it can pay the beneficiary the difference between wages actually paid and the proffered wage, which is \$5,601.25 in 2007. The petitioner must also establish that it can pay the beneficiary the proffered wage in 2001 to 2006.

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.

The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2001 to 2007, as shown in the table below.

- In 2001, the IRS Form 990 stated net income of \$10,956.00.³
- In 2002, the IRS Form 990 stated net income of \$16,384.00.
- In 2003, the IRS Form 990 stated net income of -\$163,713.00.
- In 2004, the IRS Form 990 stated net income of \$24,141.00.
- In 2005, the IRS Form 990 stated net income of \$36,360.00.
- In 2006, the IRS Form 990 stated net income of -\$356,920.00.
- In 2007, the IRS Form 990 stated net income of \$152,626.00.

³ The AAO notes that net income is listed as excess (or deficit) on line 18 of the IRS Form 990.

The petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage for 2001 to 2004 or for 2006. The petitioner demonstrated its ability to pay in 2005 and 2007.

As an alternate means of determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS may review the petitioner's net current assets. The petitioner's total assets include depreciable assets that the petitioner uses in its business, including real property that counsel asserts should be considered. 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 The AAO has reviewed the petitioner's audited financial statements for 2001 to 2006, which include financial information regarding the petitioner's total current assets and total liabilities. 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 net current assets during 2001 were \$106,089.00.
- The petitioner's net current assets during 2002 were \$207,170.00.
- The petitioner's net current assets during 2003 were \$156,223.00.
- The petitioner's net current assets during 2004 were \$139,932.00.
- The petitioner's net current assets during 2006 were -\$340,000.00.

Based on the petitioner's net current assets, it can demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage for 2001 to 2004. The petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay proffered wage for 2006.

Accordingly, from the priority date of November 19, 2001, the petitioner has not established 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.

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 (BIA 1967). The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years and

⁴ 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.

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. As in *Sonegawa*, 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 has been in business since 1955 and has employed 43 workers. The petitioner has also maintained consistently high gross income except for in 2006 when its enrollment was down. 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.

The AAO notes that it sent the petitioner a request for evidence (RFE) on August 27, 2009, which asked the petitioner to submit information as to why its business experienced significant financial losses in 2006. The petitioner responded by stating that its access to the Student and Exchange Information System (SEVIS) was interrupted in June and July 2006, which caused negative financial setbacks for the petitioner for several months to come. The record of proceeding contains no evidence specifically connecting the petitioner's business decline to its SEVIS interruption. A mere broad statement by the petitioner that, because of the nature of the petitioner's industry, its business was impacted adversely by this interruption, cannot by itself, demonstrate the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. Rather, such a general statement merely suggests, without supporting evidence, that the petitioner's financial status might have appeared stronger had it not been for this interruption. 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)).

The evidence submitted establishes that the petitioner has 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 met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.