

identifying data deleted to  
prevent identity 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**

B 6



FILE: [REDACTED]  
EAC 05 147 51978


Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **OCT 26 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.

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).

Peggy Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal.<sup>1</sup> The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a line chef. 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, 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 December 28, 2006 denial, 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The petitioner filed two appeals. One is properly filed and is before the AAO now (EAC 07 080 51029). One was late and rejected by the Director (EAC 07 083 50124). The record of proceeding also contains a previously filed petition on behalf of the beneficiary (EAC 03 253 53947), which was denied. All evidence submitted with that filing will be considered.

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 16, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$14.72 per hour for the regular 40-hour work week (\$30,617 per year) plus 15 hours of required overtime at a rate of \$22.08 per hour (\$17,222.40 per year) for a total annual wage of \$47,839.40. The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience.

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.<sup>2</sup> Relevant evidence in the record includes the restaurant's 2001, 2004, 2005 tax returns, and tax return transcripts generated by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for 2002 and 2003, Federal Income Tax Summary generated by the IRS for 2000 and 2001, W-2 form issued by the petitioner to the beneficiary, internally generated payroll records, and quarterly wage reports. The record does not contain any other evidence relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the wage.

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as an S corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1990 and to currently employ 16 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on the calendar year. According to the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on April 4, 2001, the beneficiary began working for the petitioner in 1994.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner's business viability "cannot [be] judge[d] . . . strictly on the net income figures of the business in a given year." Counsel cites the unpredictability of the economy and certain industries and states that "[t]here are hundreds of businesses which have survived years, sometimes over 10 years and are experiencing downturn of the revenue because of the poor economy." As such, she urges us to look beyond the tax returns to "letters submitted by the Petitioner and the tax information [which] clearly show an increase in profit."

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA 750 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the 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

---

<sup>2</sup> The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the 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).

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, United States 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. The petitioner submitted a W-2 form with the first petition filed indicating that it paid the beneficiary \$12,800 in 2001.<sup>3</sup> The petitioner did not submit W-2 forms for any other years that the beneficiary was employed. In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage during any relevant timeframe including the period from the priority date in 2001 as it submitted a W-2 form for only one year that the beneficiary worked for it and that W-2 form indicates that the beneficiary received less than the proffered wage for that year. The petitioner must demonstrate that it can pay the difference between the wages actually paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage in 2001. The petitioner must demonstrate it can pay the full proffered wage in the remaining years.

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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> The W-2 statement contains "whited out" areas in two portions of the form, one under the section the "Employee's name." The reason for this "white out" is unclear.

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*, 558 F.3d 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*, 719 F.Supp. at 537 (emphasis added).

The record before the director closed on October 19, 2006 with the receipt by the director of the petitioner’s submissions in response to the director’s second request for evidence. As of that date, the petitioner’s 2006 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner’s income tax return for 2005 is the most recent return available. The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2001 to 2005, as shown in the table below.

In 2001, the Form 1120S stated net income<sup>4</sup> of \$2,021.

---

<sup>4</sup> 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 (2001-2003) and line 17e (2004-2005) of Schedule K. See Instructions for Form 1120S, 2006, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (accessed August 26, 2009) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholder’s shares of the corporation’s income, deductions, credits, etc.). Because the petitioner had additional adjustments shown on its Schedule K in all of the years at issue, the petitioner’s net income is found on Schedule K of its tax return.

- In 2002, the IRS Tax Return Listing stated net income of \$8,468.
- In 2003, the IRS Tax Return Listing stated net income (loss) of -\$36,793.
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net income (loss) of -\$18,783.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$2,549.

Therefore, for all of these years, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage from 2002 to 2005 or the difference between wages actually paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage in 2001.

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.<sup>5</sup> 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 returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets for 2001, 2004, and 2005, as shown in the table below.<sup>6</sup>

- In 2001, the Form 1120S stated net current assets (liabilities) of -\$15,051.
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net current assets (liabilities) of -\$59,888.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net current assets (liabilities) of -\$22,908.

Therefore, the petitioner did not demonstrate sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage for any of the years 2001 to 2005.

Therefore, from the date 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 as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or 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

---

<sup>5</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>6</sup> The petitioner did not submit its full Form 1120S with all schedules and returns for 2002 or 2003. Instead, the IRS Tax Return Listings submitted for these years do not contain a complete Schedule L and full information to analyze the petitioner's net current assets.

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.

In the instant case, however, the petitioner did not provide evidence of an "off year" or unusual circumstance or expense. Instead, the evidence presented shows that the petitioner has consistent gross receipts, modest officer compensation that fluctuates between \$71,000 and \$119,000, and overall modest wages paid initially in 2001 of \$28,000, which rose in 2004, but dropped significantly to \$135,000 in 2005. The evidence submitted contains no information about the reputation enjoyed by the petitioner or evidence that shows that it had just one uncharacteristic year such as in *Sonegawa*. A February 21, 2007 letter from [REDACTED] the petitioner's president, states that the beneficiary has been employed by the petitioner since 2003 and that the beneficiary received \$550 per week (\$28,600 per year) during that time. We note that this amount is less than the proffered wage or the amount including overtime that the petitioner required. In addition, the petitioner submitted no evidence supporting the statements of its president (such as through W-2 statements, Forms 941, checks or pay stubs for wages paid after 2001). 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)). Overall, the evidence shows that the petitioner has not been capable of paying the beneficiary's wage for any of the years for which evidence was submitted. 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.

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*, 229 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 Form ETA 750 indicates that

a minimum of two years experience is required for the position. 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). On the ETA Form 750B, the beneficiary represented that he worked for Bar/Restaurant La Amistad for one year as a cook and from 1994 to the time the petition was filed with the petitioner as a line chef. The only evidence submitted regarding the beneficiary's experience is a letter from [REDACTED] stating that the beneficiary worked as a chef at the restaurant "La Amistad" between 1988 and 1989. This letter does not indicate what type of work the beneficiary did at La Amistad nor does it show that the beneficiary worked for two years at that place of employment. As a result, we are unable to conclude that the beneficiary possesses the requisite two years of experience so as to be eligible for the employment offered under the terms of the Form ETA 750.

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.