

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:



Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **NOV 29 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. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently \$585, but will increase to \$630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the \$630 fee. 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, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a bookkeeper. As required by statute, the Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (USDOL). The director determined the petitioner had not established it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence.

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.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of 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) provides 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 ETA Form 9089 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the USDOL. *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 ETA Form 9089 as certified by the USDOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

Here, the ETA Form 9089 that was accepted for processing on May 19, 2006, shows the proffered wage as \$12.12 per hour (\$25,209.60 per year) and that the position requires two years 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.¹

The petitioner is structured as a C corporation and was established in 1971 and employed six persons at the time of filing. Its IRS Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Returns, reflect it operates on a calendar year basis. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on January 29, 2007, she did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

A certified labor certification establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA Form 9089. Therefore, 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 a 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).

USCIS first examines whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary from the priority date onwards. A finding that the petitioner employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage is considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay. In this case, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date of May 19, 2006 or subsequently.

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 next examines 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); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d. 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010). 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.

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 this case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava, supra*, at 1084, the court held that 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. See *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d. at 881 (gross profits overstate an employer's ability to pay because it ignores other necessary expenses).

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 IRS Form 1120. The record before the director closed on March 12, 2008 with the receipt of the petitioner's submissions in response to the director's request for evidence. As of that date, the petitioner's 2007 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2006 is the most recent return available. The petitioner's IRS Form 1120 tax return for 2006 demonstrates its net income as \$22,357.

Therefore, for the year 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.² 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 2006 demonstrates its net current assets for the required period as -\$16,032.

Therefore, for the year 2006, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.

Therefore, from the date the ETA Form 9089 was accepted for processing by the USDOL, 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.

On appeal, counsel states the director's decision is arbitrary, capricious and is an abuse of discretion and is therefore clearly erroneous as a matter of law and fact. Counsel submits no new evidence but argues that the cash listed on a Schedule L of an income tax return does not include the money from the petitioner's bank account. Counsel states that cash on hand within the Internal Revenue Code is different than monies contained within a bank account for tax reporting purposes. Counsel further states that the petitioner's bank account records establishes cash on hand that can be used to pay salaries and can be used to establish the ability to pay in conjunction with net profits and net assets. Counsel outlines the petitioner's purported cash balance on a monthly basis from January 2006 through December 2007.

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 the petitioner 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. Further, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. Finally, no evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the funds reported on the petitioner's bank statement somehow reflect additional funds that were not reflected on its tax returns, such as the petitioner's cash specified on Schedules L that was considered in determining the petitioner's net current assets. Simply put, counsel fails to establish that this cash was not included in the Schedule L and, if so, why it was omitted.

²According 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.

Counsel states USCIS is incorrect in what “net current assets” are and concludes that the director reached the wrong decision in finding the petitioner’s net current assets were -\$55,951 for 2005. Counsel indicates that it is clearly stated on the IRS forms in Schedule L at line 15 what the total assets are. Counsel continues that the best proof of the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage (after the beneficiary’s salary) includes the corporate tax return and corporate net assets combined. We reject, however, the idea that the petitioner’s total assets should have been considered in the determination of the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner’s total assets include depreciable assets that the petitioner uses in its business. 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.

Counsel further states the best proof of the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage (after the beneficiary’s salary) is to combine net income and net current assets. This approach is unacceptable because net income and net current assets are not, in the view of the AAO, cumulative. The AAO views net income and net current assets as two different ways of methods of demonstrating the petitioner’s ability to pay the wage--one retrospective and one prospective. Net income is retrospective in nature because it represents the sum of income remaining after all expenses were paid over the course of the previous tax year. Conversely, the net current assets figure is a prospective “snapshot” of the net total of petitioner’s assets that will become cash within a relatively short period of time minus those expenses that will come due within that same period of time. Thus, the petitioner is expected to receive roughly one-twelfth of its net current assets during each month of the coming year. Given that net income is retrospective and net current assets are prospective in nature, the AAO does not agree with counsel that the two figures can be combined in a meaningful way to illustrate the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage during a single tax year. Moreover, combining the net income and net current assets could double-count certain figures, such as cash on hand and, in the case of a taxpayer who reports taxes pursuant to accrual convention, accounts receivable.

Counsel’s assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax returns as submitted by the petitioner that demonstrates that the petitioner could not pay the proffered wage from the day the ETA Form 9089 was accepted for processing by the USDOL.

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, supra.* The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years. 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 this case, considering also the petitioner's 2005 tax return, the corporation's gross receipts exceeded its cost of goods sold by \$90,590 in 2005 and \$143,123 in 2006 showing modest gross profits. Although the corporation claimed six workers in 2006 when the petition was filed, in the entire year of 2006, it only paid out \$38,300 in salary and wages and no compensation to officers. It is noted that had the beneficiary been paid the proffered wage of \$25,209.60 during 2006 as one of the six workers, her salary would have approached the salary and wages of \$38,300 paid to the staff of the company for the entire year. Although counsel argues that the volume of business has increased based upon the increase of gross sales, net profits and net current assets, any gains have been modest. In this case, the corporation has not established its historical growth, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, its reputation within the industry or whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service. 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 beginning on the priority date.

Beyond the decision of the director, on the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on January 29, 2007, she stated that she worked for "Price Waterhouse Coopers" in Kingston, Jamaica, from July 15, 1991 until June 6, 2002 as a bookkeeper. However, in two employment verification letters both dated January 12, 2007 from [REDACTED] of "PricewaterhouseCoopers" in Kingston, Jamaica, [REDACTED] stated the beneficiary worked for the company for ten years until June 2002. That would have placed her employment starting date in 1992 and not in 1991 as asserted by the beneficiary. Additionally, the January 12, 2007 letters are poor copies and appear to be altered with some parts of the letters being darker than others. Also, the first January 12, 2007 letter appears to have been copied and not typed directly on the PricewaterhouseCoopers letterhead while the second January 12, 2007 letter, although signed by Ms. [REDACTED], has no letterhead. Therefore, the appeal shall be dismissed for the additional reason that the evidence to establish that the beneficiary met the two year experience requirement in the ETA Form 9089 has not been established by the employment documentation submitted for the record in her behalf. It is noted that doubt cast on any aspect of the proof submitted by the petitioner may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the Form I-140. Further, the petitioner must resolve any inconsistencies in the record with competent, independent, objective evidence. Attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence sufficient to demonstrate where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

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.