


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy  
**PUBLIC COPY**

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

B6



FILE:



Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date: **AUG 18 2010**

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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

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 dismissed.

The petitioner is an appliance retailer. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an office manager. 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 demonstrated its ability to pay the proffered wage. 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 March 20, 2008 denial, the issue in this case is whether the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage from the date the labor certification was filed onward.

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 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 January 27, 2004. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$20.00 per hour (\$41,600 per year).<sup>1</sup> The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience as an office manager or personnel manager.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>2</sup>

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a C corporation. The petition states that the company was established in 1983 and currently employs three workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is the same as the calendar year. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on January 23, 2004, the beneficiary stated that he began working for the petitioner in July 2003.

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 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 the following Forms W-2:

- The 2004 Form W-2 states that the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$18,000.
- The 2005 Form W-2 states that the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$36,000.
- The 2006 Form W-2 states that the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$36,000.
- The 2007 Form W-2 states that the petitioner paid the beneficiary \$42,000.

---

<sup>1</sup> The labor certification states an overtime rate of \$27 per hour, but lists overtime as "varied" and does not require a specific amount.

<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).

The Form W-2 for 2007 shows that the petitioner paid the beneficiary in excess of the proffered wage for that year. The Forms W-2 for 2004, 2005, and 2006 show that the petitioner paid the beneficiary less than the proffered wage for those years. The petitioner must thus establish its ability to pay the difference between the actual wage paid and the proffered wage, which in 2005 and 2006 was \$5,600 and in 2004 was \$23,600.

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. [REDACTED], 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 sales and profits and wage expense 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.

In [REDACTED] 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*, 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).

For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The record before the director closed on January 22, 2008 with the receipt by the director of the petitioner’s submissions in response to the director’s request for evidence. The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate its net income for tax years 2004 and 2005, as shown in the table below.

- The tax year 2004 Form 1120 stated net income of -\$276.
- The tax year 2005 Form 1120 stated net income of -\$327.

The petitioner did not submit its tax year 2006 Form 1120, which should have been available at the time of filing the Form I-140 petition.<sup>3</sup> For the tax years 2004 and 2005, the petitioner’s tax returns demonstrated negative net income, so would be insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the difference between the actual wage paid 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. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner’s current assets and current liabilities.<sup>4</sup> A corporation’s year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6 and include cash-on-hand. 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. In the case at hand, however, we are unable to calculate the petitioner’s net current assets. Pursuant to IRS instructions for Form 1120, a corporation with total receipts (line 1a plus all other income, lines 4 through 10 on page 1 and total assets at the end of the tax year or less than \$250,000 are not required to complete Schedules L, M-1, and M-2, if the “yes” box is checked on Schedule K, question 13. See <http://www.irs.gov/instructions/i1120/ch02.html>, accessed as of August 6, 2010. In the case at hand, the petitioner lists that it had total assets and total receipts of under \$250,000 in both tax years,

<sup>3</sup> The director noted this deficiency in his decision, yet the petitioner failed to submit this or its 2007 return on appeal.

<sup>4</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.

and checked “yes” on Schedule K, question 13. As the petitioner has not completed Schedule L, and we cannot determine the petitioner’s net current assets, it cannot demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage through its net current assets.

Additionally, the petitioner did not submit its tax return for 2006. Therefore, the petitioner cannot demonstrate sufficient net current assets to pay the difference between the actual wage paid and the proffered wage in any of these years.

Therefore, from the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL, the petitioner did not establish its continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of the wages paid, its net income, and net current assets.

Instead of tax returns for 2006, the petitioner submitted its “income statement.” Counsel’s reliance on unaudited financial records is misplaced. 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. As there is no accountant’s report accompanying these statements, the AAO cannot conclude that they represent audited statements. Unaudited financial statements are the representations of management. The unsupported representations of management are not reliable evidence and are insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner submitted its bank statements covering the months of August 2007, September 2007, November 2007, December 2007, and January 2008. The petitioner’s reliance on the balance in the bank account is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), required to illustrate a petitioner’s ability to pay a proffered wage. While this regulation allows additional material “in appropriate cases,” the petitioner in this case has not demonstrated why the documentation specified at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) is inapplicable or otherwise paints an inaccurate financial picture of the petitioner. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. Third, no evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the funds reported on the petitioner’s bank statements somehow reflect additional available funds that would not be reflected on its tax return, such as the petitioner’s taxable income (income minus deductions) or the cash specified on Schedule L considered in determining petitioner’s net current assets had the petitioner submitted its returns for those years.

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a letter from Wachovia Bank stating that it has a \$50,000 line of credit, which was “closed out” on August 23, 2006. In calculating the ability to pay the proffered salary, USCIS will not augment the petitioner’s net income or net current assets by adding in the corporation’s credit limits, bank lines, or lines of credit. A “bank line” or “line of credit” is a bank’s unenforceable commitment to make loans to a particular borrower up to a specified maximum during a specified time period. A line of credit is not a contractual or legal obligation on the part of the bank. *See Barron’s Dictionary of Finance and Investment Terms*, 45 (1998).

Since the line of credit is a “commitment to loan” and not an existent loan, the petitioner has not established that the unused funds from the line of credit are available at the time of filing the petition. As noted above, a petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing; a petition cannot be approved at a future date after the petitioner becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *See Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm. 1971). Comparable to the limit on a credit card, the line of credit cannot be treated as cash or as a cash asset. However, if the petitioner wishes to rely on a line of credit as evidence of ability to pay, the petitioner must submit documentary evidence, such as a detailed business plan and audited cash flow statements, to demonstrate that the line of credit will augment and not weaken its overall financial position. Finally, USCIS will give less weight to loans and debt as a means of paying salary since the debts will increase the firm’s liabilities and will not improve its overall financial position. Although lines of credit and debt are an integral part of any business operation, USCIS must evaluate the overall financial position of a petitioner to determine whether the employer is making a realistic job offer and has the overall financial ability to satisfy the proffered wage. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977). Additionally, the bank letter indicates that the line of credit was closed out in 2006.

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 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 submitted no evidence showing that it has historically grown, that it has a sound business reputation, that it incurred uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, or any other factors to liken its situation to the one in *Sonogawa*. The tax returns show fairly low gross receipts of under \$250,000 for 2004 and 2005, half of its 2003 gross receipts. Additionally, the tax returns show that the total wages paid to all workers by the petitioner have varied from \$18,000 in

2004 and \$36,000 in 2005, both of which are less than the proffered wage amount. The petitioner failed to submit its 2006 or 2007 tax return. On appeal, counsel states that the line of credit should be considered as well as the amount of business inventory in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. However, as stated above, a line of credit is an unenforceable commitment by the bank and is otherwise reflected on the tax returns. The reliance upon business inventory is misplaced: the petitioner's tax returns state inventory at the beginning of the year and not year-end. While inventory would be considered in a net current asset calculation, the petitioner's 2004 and 2005 returns do not contain the information required to allow us to calculate the petitioner's net current assets. Therefore, we would not consider inventory in the absence of information regarding the petitioner's current liabilities. 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 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.