

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

[REDACTED]

**OCT 26 2010**

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date:

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 a software development and consulting firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States in software engineering applications. 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).<sup>1</sup> 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.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C.

---

<sup>1</sup> The case involves the substitution of a beneficiary on the labor certification. There is no evidence in the record that indicates that the original beneficiary received any benefits as a result of filing this certified labor certification. Substitution of beneficiaries was permitted by the DOL at the time of filing this petition. DOL had published an interim final rule, which limited the validity of an approved labor certification to the specific alien named on the labor certification application. *See* 56 Fed. Reg. 54925, 54930 (October 23, 1991). The interim final rule eliminated the practice of substitution. On December 1, 1994, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, acting under the mandate of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Kooritzky v. Reich*, 17 F.3d 1509 (D.C. Cir. 1994), issued an order invalidating the portion of the interim final rule, which eliminated substitution of labor certification beneficiaries. The *Kooritzky* decision effectively led 20 CFR §§ 656.30(c)(1) and (2) to read the same as the regulations had read before November 22, 1991, and allow the substitution of a beneficiary. Following the *Kooritzky* decision, DOL processed substitution requests pursuant to a May 4, 1995 DOL Field Memorandum, which reinstated procedures in existence prior to the implementation of the Immigration Act of 1990 (IMMACT 90). DOL delegated responsibility for substituting labor certification beneficiaries to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) based on a Memorandum of Understanding, which was recently rescinded. *See* 72 Fed. Reg. 27904 (May 17, 2007) (codified at 20 C.F.R. § 656). DOL's final rule became effective July 16, 2007 and prohibits the substitution of alien beneficiaries on permanent labor certification applications and resulting certifications. As the filing of the instant case predates the rule, substitution will be allowed for the present petition. An I-140 petition for a substituted beneficiary retains the same priority date as the original ETA 750 (in this case, the ETA 9089). Memo. from [REDACTED] Immigration and Naturalization Service, to Regional Directors, *et al.*, Immigration and Naturalization Service, *Substitution of Labor Certification Beneficiaries*, at 3, [http://ows.doleta.gov/dmstree/fm/fm96/fm\\_28-96a.pdf](http://ows.doleta.gov/dmstree/fm/fm96/fm_28-96a.pdf) (March 7, 1996).

§ 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.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, are professionals.

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 September 3, 2004. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$48,000 per year. The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires a four-year bachelors/equivalent experience in engineering, science, math, equivalent and one year of experience in the job offered of computer software engineering applications or one year of experience as a programmer analyst.

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. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established on December 9, 1998, to have a gross

---

<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).

annual income of \$8 million, and to currently employ 105 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 July 12, 2007, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.<sup>3</sup>

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. In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date or subsequently. Therefore, the petitioner is obligated to show that it had sufficient funds to pay the entire proffered wage of \$48,000 from the priority date of September 3, 2004 and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In addition, the AAO notes that the petitioner has filed immigrant and non-immigrant petitions for additional sponsored beneficiaries with the same and subsequent priority date years.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the petitioner is obligated to show that it had sufficient funds to pay the proffered wages to not only the beneficiary, but to all the sponsored beneficiaries with the same or subsequent priority date 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); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, -

---

<sup>3</sup> The AAO notes that the beneficiary claims to have worked at [REDACTED] at the same address as the petitioner.

<sup>4</sup> The AAO notes that the petitioner has filed a total of 280 immigrant and non-immigrant petitions from 2004 to the present. However, the AAO further notes that according to the 2008 Forms 941, Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Returns, submitted by the petitioner, the petitioner's number of employees ranged from a low of 50 employees in the fourth quarter of 2008 to a high of 102 employees in the second quarter of 2008. The petitioner failed to submit the names of its employees on the Forms 941 in any of the quarters of 2008.

-- F. Supp. 2d. ---, 2010 WL 956001, at \*6 (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 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 *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 the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. See *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, --- F. Supp. 2d. at \*6 (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 118. "[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 petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2004 through 2007,<sup>5</sup> as shown in the table below.

- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net income of [REDACTED]
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net income of [REDACTED]
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net income of [REDACTED]
- In 2007, the Form 1120 stated net income of [REDACTED]

Therefore, for the year 2004, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage. While it appears that the petitioner had sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage in 2005 through 2007, the petitioner has not established that it could pay the proffered wage of \$48,000 to the beneficiary and the proffered wages to all the sponsored beneficiaries with the same or subsequent priority date years.

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. 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. Rather, USCIS will consider net current assets as an alternative method of demonstrating the ability to pay the proffered wage.

Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.<sup>6</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. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current

---

<sup>5</sup> The AAO notes that the petitioner has submitted a copy of its 2003 Form 1120 as evidence of its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage of \$48,000. However, the 2003 tax return is for the year prior to the priority date of September 3, 2004; and therefore, has little probative value when evaluating the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date. Therefore, the AAO will not consider the petitioner's 2003 tax return except when evaluating the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning business if the evidence warrants such consideration. See *Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

<sup>6</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 as accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

assets for 2004 through 2007, as shown in the table below.

- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of [REDACTED]
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of [REDACTED]
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of [REDACTED]
- In 2007, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of [REDACTED]

Therefore, for the year 2004, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage. Again, while it appears that the petitioner had sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage in 2005 through 2007, the petitioner has not established that it could pay the proffered wage of \$48,000 to the beneficiary and the proffered wages to all the sponsored beneficiaries with the same or subsequent priority date years.

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.

On appeal, the petitioner asserts that the petitioner has established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage based on its gross receipts, bank statements, and longevity. The petitioner cites *Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (BIA 1967) and *Construction and Design, Co. v. USCIS*, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 8253, (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009) in support of its contention.

The petitioner'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 Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL.

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.

The petitioner's reliance on the balances in the petitioner's 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 were not reflected on its tax return, such as the petitioner's taxable income (income minus deductions) or the cash specified on Schedule L that will be considered below in determining the petitioner's net current assets. Therefore, the AAO will not consider the petitioner's bank statements when evaluating the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage of \$48,000 to the beneficiary and the

proffered wages to the additional sponsored beneficiaries with the same or subsequent priority date years.

The seventh circuit court of appeals recently issued a precedent decision in *Construction and Design Co. v. USCIS*, 563 F.3d 593 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009). In that case, the seventh circuit directly addressed the method used by USCIS in determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. The employer in *Construction and Design* was a small construction company which was organized as a Subchapter S corporation. The employer sought to employ the beneficiary at a salary of over \$50,000 per year.<sup>7</sup> The court noted that, according to the employer's tax returns and balance sheet, its net income and net assets were close to zero.<sup>8</sup> The court also noted that the owner of the corporation received officer compensation of approximately \$40,000.<sup>9</sup>

In considering the employer's ability to pay the proffered wage, the court stated that if an employer "has enough cash flow, either existing or anticipated, to be able to pay the salary of a new employee along with its other expenses, it can "afford" that salary unless there is some reason, which might or might not be revealed by its balance sheet or other accounting records, why it would be an improvident expenditure."<sup>10</sup>

The court then turned to an examination of the USCIS method for determining an employer's ability to pay the proffered wage. The court noted that USCIS "looks at a firm's income tax returns and balance sheet first."<sup>11</sup> The court, recognizing that the employer bears the burden of proof, went on to state that if the petitioner's tax returns do not establish its ability to pay the proffered wage the petitioner "has to prove by other evidence its ability to pay the alien's salary."<sup>12</sup> The court found that the employer had failed to establish that it had sufficient resources to pay the proffered wage "plus employment taxes (plus employee benefits, if any)."<sup>13</sup>

Thus, the court in *Construction and Design* concurred with existing USCIS procedure in determining an employer's ability to pay the proffered wage. This method involves (1) a determination of whether a petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage; (2) where the petitioner does not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage during the relevant period, an examination of the net income figure and net current assets reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax returns; and (3) an examination of the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning business pursuant to *Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

---

<sup>7</sup> 563 F.3d at 595.

<sup>8</sup> Id.

<sup>9</sup> Id.

<sup>10</sup> Id.

<sup>11</sup> Id. at 596.

<sup>12</sup> Id.

<sup>13</sup> Id.

Further, the court in *Construction and Design* noted that the “proffered wage” actually understates the cost to the employer in hiring an employee, as the employer must pay the salary “plus employment taxes (plus employee benefits, if any).” As noted above, because the instant case arose in the seventh circuit, the AAO is bound by the seventh circuit’s decision in *Construction and Design*. Therefore, pursuant to the decision in *Construction and Design*, the petitioner in the instant case must establish that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage plus compensation expenses for the employee which may include legally required benefits (social security, Medicare, federal and state unemployment insurance, and worker’s compensation), employer costs for providing insurance benefits (life, health, disability), paid leave benefits (vacations, holidays, sick and personal leave), retirement and savings (defined benefit and defined contribution), and supplemental pay (overtime and premium, shift differentials, and nonproduction bonuses). The costs of such benefits are significant. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined that, in order to calculate the “fully burdened” wage rate (i.e., the base wage rate plus an adjustment for the cost of benefits) the wage rate may be multiplied by 1.4.<sup>14</sup> In this case, as noted above, the proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 750 is \$48,000 per year. Using the OMB-approved formula, the “fully burdened” wage rate in this case equates to \$67,200 per year. Therefore, pursuant to the seventh circuit decision in *Construction and Design*, the petitioner in this case must establish its ability to pay \$67,200 per year and the proffered wages to the additional sponsored beneficiaries with the same or subsequent priority date years.

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

---

<sup>14</sup> The 1.4 multiplier is from the Bureau of Labor Statistics 2009: <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/eccc.t01.htm>

USCIS deems relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In the instant case, the petitioner's tax returns indicate it was incorporated on December 9, 1998. The petitioner has provided its tax return for 2004 through 2007, with none of the returns establishing the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$48,000 to the beneficiary and the proffered wages to the additional sponsored beneficiaries with the same or similar priority dates. 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 9089 and Form ETA 9089). *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In addition, the petitioner would be obligated to pay each H-1B petition beneficiary the prevailing wage in accordance with DOL regulations, and the labor condition application certified with each H-1B petition. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.715. In this case, the petitioner has not established that it had sufficient funds to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary and the additional sponsored beneficiaries with the same and subsequent priority dates. Further, the tax returns are not enough evidence to establish that the business has met all of its obligations in the past or to establish its historical growth. There is also no probative evidence of the petitioner's reputation throughout the industry or of any temporary and uncharacteristic disruption in its business activities. 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 evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.