

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

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 01 2010

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:

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 \$630. 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,  
*Elizabeth McCormack*

Perry Rhew  
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 an engineering firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cost estimator. 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 May 22, 2008 denial, the issue in this case is whether 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 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 May 23, 2003. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$30.25 per hour (\$62,920.00 annually). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering, and two years work experience in the job offered.

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>1</sup>

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a C corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1978. The petitioner indicated that it currently employs 3 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on May 14, 2003, the beneficiary claims to have been employed by the petitioner since November 2002.

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, 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.

If the wages paid do not equal or exceed the proffered wage, the petitioner is obligated to show that it can pay the difference between the proffered wage and wages already paid in each year. The proffered wage is \$62,920.00 per year. The record of proceeding contains evidence of wages paid to the beneficiary as shown in the table below.

- In 2003, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$26,312.00 (deficiency of \$36,608.00 to reach the proffered wage).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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. § 1234083868103.2(a)(1).

- In 2004, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$35,211.20 (deficiency of \$27,708.80 to reach the proffered wage).
- In 2005, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$38,332.80 (deficiency of \$24,587.20 to reach the proffered wage).
- In 2006, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$41,184.00 (deficiency of \$21,736.00 to reach the proffered wage).

Therefore, for the years 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006, the petitioner has not established that it paid the beneficiary the full 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 throughout the designated period, then 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.

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* 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* 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 March 2, 2007 with the receipt by the director of the petitioner’s submission of its Form I-140 and evidence to support its position. As of that date, the petitioner’s 2006 federal income tax return was not yet due. However, the petitioner’s 2006 tax return is the most recent return available in the record before the director. The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate its net income as shown in the table below.

- In 2003, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$26,329.00.
- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net income of (\$12,425.00).
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net income of (\$7,977.00).
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$13,418.00.

Therefore, for the years 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

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>2</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 return demonstrates its end-of-year net current assets as shown in the table below.

- In 2003, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$332.00.
- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of (\$958.00).

---

<sup>2</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.

- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of (\$958.00).
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$20,549.00.

The evidence demonstrates that for the years 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.

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.

Counsel contends on appeal that the director violated 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8) by failing to request further evidence before denying the petition. The cited regulation requires the director to request additional evidence in instances "where there is no evidence of ineligibility, and initial evidence or eligibility information is missing." *Id.* The director is not required to issue a request for further information in every potentially deniable case. If the director determines that the initial evidence supports a decision of denial, the cited regulation does not require solicitation of further documentation. The director did not deny the petition based on insufficient evidence of eligibility.

Furthermore, even if the director had committed a procedural error by failing to solicit further evidence, it is not clear what remedy would be appropriate beyond the appeal process itself. The petitioner has in fact supplemented the record on appeal, and therefore it would serve no useful purpose to remand the case simply to afford the petitioner the opportunity to supplement the record with new evidence.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8) clearly states that a petition shall be denied "[i]f there is evidence of ineligibility in the record." The regulation does not state that the evidence of ineligibility must be irrefutable. Where evidence of record indicates that a basic element of eligibility has not been met, it is appropriate for the director to deny the petition without a request for evidence. If the petitioner has rebuttal evidence, the administrative process provides for a motion to reopen, motion to reconsider, or an appeal as a forum for that new evidence. In the present case, the evidence indicated that the petitioner had failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage. Accordingly, the denial was appropriate, even though the petitioner might have had evidence or argument to rebut the finding.

Counsel contends that the petitioner need not pay the proffered wage if it has paid the prevailing wage, citing *Masonry Masters, Inc. v. Thornburgh*, 742 F. Supp. 682 (D.D.C. 1990), *remanded in* 875 F.2d 898 (D.C. Cir. 1989). That holding is not binding outside the District of Columbia, and it does not stand for the proposition that a petitioner's unsupported assertions have greater weight than its tax returns. The Court held that USCIS should not require a petitioner to show the ability to pay more than the prevailing wage. Counsel has not shown a difference between the proffered wage and the prevailing wage in this proceeding, and the petitioning organization is not located in the District of Columbia. *See also, Masonry Masters, Inc. v. Thornburgh*, 875 F.2d 898 (D.C. Cir. 1989).

Furthermore, USCIS may not make changes to the wage approved by DOL. Its role is to determine whether the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage approved by DOL from the priority date. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

Counsel asserts that according to the language in Mr. Yates' memorandum, the petitioner is a bona fide company and therefore, it has established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

The Yates' memorandum relied upon by counsel provides guidance to adjudicators to review a record of proceeding and make a determination of a petitioning entity's ability to pay. The AAO consistently adjudicates appeals in accordance with the Yates memorandum. The AAO finds that the director followed the plain language of the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), and the policy guidelines set forth in the Yates memorandum.

Counsel cites to unpublished decisions issued by the AAO concerning the totality of the circumstances in assessing the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions of USCIS are binding on all its employees in the administration of the Act, unpublished decisions are not similarly binding. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a).

Counsel's assertions and the evidence presented on appeal do not outweigh the evidence of record that demonstrates that the petitioner could not pay the proffered wage from the day the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL.

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 assessing the totality of the circumstances in this case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage. There are no facts paralleling those in *Sonegawa* that are present in the instant matter to a degree sufficient to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner has not submitted evidence establishing its business reputation. Nor has the petitioner demonstrated the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses in 2003, 2004, 2005 or 2006. Counsel states that the petitioner has been operating its business successfully since 1981, has always met its payroll obligations and has paid the beneficiary in excess of the prevailing wage. Reliance on the petitioner's gross receipts and wage expense is misplaced. Similarly, the petitioner showing that it paid wages in excess of the prevailing wage is insufficient. Furthermore, the petitioner has not shown through audited financial documents that its business success has been significant enough to allow it to pay the beneficiary's wage. *See Sonegawa, supra*. 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 petitioner has not submitted evidence to establish that the beneficiary is replacing a former employee whose primary duties were described in the Form ETA 750. Accordingly, the evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

Beyond the decision of the director, USCIS records show that the petitioner has filed another immigrant petition subsequent to the priority date of the instant petition; and therefore, the petitioner must establish that it had sufficient funds to pay all the wages from the priority date and continuing to the present. If the instant petition were the only petition filed by the petitioner, the petitioner would be required to produce evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage to the single beneficiary of the instant petition. However, where a petitioner has filed multiple petitions for multiple beneficiaries which have been pending simultaneously, the petitioner must produce evidence that its job offers to each beneficiary are realistic, and therefore, that it has the ability to pay the proffered wages to each of the beneficiaries of its pending petitions, as of the priority date of each petition and continuing until the beneficiary of each petition obtains lawful permanent residence. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977) (petitioner must establish ability to pay as of the date of the Form MA 7-50B job offer, the predecessor to the Form ETA 750). *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). Accordingly, even if the instant record established the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage for the instant beneficiary, which it does not, the fact that there are multiple petitions would further call into question the petitioner's eligibility for the benefit sought.

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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

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.