

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.E., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

B6

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JAN 11 2011

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

[REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other, Unskilled Worker Pursuant to § 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,

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 a travel and tour organization which seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a travel agent. As required by statute, the Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien 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)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii), provides for the granting of preference classification to other qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal 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 above regulation sets forth the requirement that a petitioning entity demonstrate its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. The priority date is the date the Form ETA 750 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 demonstrate that on the priority date, the beneficiary met the qualifications stated on the Form ETA 750 certified by the USDOL. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on April 18, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$20 per hour (\$41,600 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires one year experience in the job offered or in the related occupation of travel agent.

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 petitioner is structured as a C corporation and was established in 1983, had gross annual income of \$1,741,234, 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 Form ETA 750, Part B, statement of qualifications of alien, signed by the beneficiary on April 11, 2001, she did not state she had been employed by the petitioner.

A certified labor certification establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the Form ETA 750 labor certification application. 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 resident status. 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 Sonegawa*, 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 April 18, 2001 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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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

---

<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. § 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).

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 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 April 25, 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 2008 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2007 is the most recent return available. The petitioner's IRS Form 1120 tax returns demonstrate its net income for the years of the requisite period below:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Net Income</u>
2001	-\$27,613
2002	-\$53,821
2003	\$30,424

2004	\$73,696
2005	-\$88,492
2006	\$14,547
2007	\$10,921 <sup>2</sup>

Therefore, for the years 2001 through 2003 and 2005 through 2007, 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>3</sup> A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If the total of a corporation's end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net current assets for the required period, as shown in the table below:

Year	Net Current Assets
2001	\$15,364
2002	-\$28,815
2003	-\$7,514
2004	\$79,538
2005	-\$23,586
2006	\$14,459
2007	<sup>4</sup>

Therefore, for the years 2001 through 2003 and 2005 through 2007, 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 USDOL, the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered

<sup>2</sup> It is noted the petitioner submitted the first page of the corporation's 2007 IRS Form 1120 tax return on appeal. As of the Form I-140 filing date of September 1, 2007, the petitioner's 2007 federal income tax return was not yet available due to its application for a six month extension.

<sup>3</sup> According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 2000), "current assets" consist of items having (in most cases) a life of one year or less, such as cash, marketable securities, inventory and prepaid expenses. "Current liabilities" are obligations payable (in most cases) within one year, such accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

<sup>4</sup> Although the petitioner submitted the first page of the corporation's 2007 IRS Form 1120 tax return on appeal, it did not submit its Schedule L for that year for the record.

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 previous counsel failed to provide USCIS with the financial records of the petitioner's parent company, [REDACTED] Incorporated. Counsel submits a copy of the foreign company's brochure and states that in addition to the petitioner, it has other branches in San Francisco and Tokyo, Japan. Counsel further states that the petitioner receives subsidies from the company in the Philippines including logistic and financial support such as payroll and other funds necessary to maintain its branch office in San Francisco. Counsel also submits financial records from that company in the Philippines including tax filings, remittance receipts from the petitioner and proof of ownership for [REDACTED] the Philippines. Counsel argues that this asset should be considered by USCIS following guidance provided by a memorandum from William R. Yates, Associate Director For Operations, *Determination of Ability to Pay under 8 CFR 204.5(g)(2)*, HQOPRD 90/16.45, (May 4, 2004). With regard to the May 4, 2004 memorandum, the AAO first looks to the Act, agency regulations, precedent decision of the agency and published decisions from the circuit court of appeals from whatever circuit that the action arose. *See N.L.R.B. v. Ashkenazy Property Management Corp.*, 817 F.2d 74, 75 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987) (administrative agencies are not free to refuse to follow precedent in cases originating within the circuit); *R.L. Inv. Ltd. Partners v. INS*, 86 F. Supp. 2d 1014, 1022 (D. Haw. 2000), *aff'd*, 273 F.3d 874 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001) (unpublished agency decisions and agency legal memoranda are not binding under the APA, even when they are published in private publications or widely circulated). USCIS internal memoranda do not establish judicially enforceable rights. *See Loa-Herrera v. Trominski*, 231 F.3d 984, 989 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000) (An agency's internal guidelines "neither confer upon [plaintiffs] substantive rights nor provide procedures upon which [they] may rely.") Additionally, the building in the Philippines cited by counsel does not belong to the petitioning corporation.

Corporations are classified as members of a controlled group if they are connected through certain stock ownership. All corporate members of a controlled group are treated as one single entity for tax purposes (i.e., only one set of graduated income tax brackets and respective tax rates applies to the group's total taxable income). In this case, the petitioner is not shown to be treated as a member of a controlled group for tax purposes. The petitioner and [REDACTED] are separate entities. It is noted a C corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders. Therefore, USCIS does not "pierce the corporate veil" and look to the assets of the corporation's owner or shareholders or the assets of other corporations in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of M*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958), *Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980), and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980).

Counsel submits the petitioner's City and County of San Francisco business registration certificate for fiscal year 2008-09 and other corporate documents including articles of its filing transcript, articles and notices concerning incorporation, its fictitious business name statement, its State of California "Statement by Domestic Stock Corporation," its IRS employer identification number assignment, its certificate of organization, and sample stock certificates. Counsel argues that the

petitioner has sufficient assets to support and prove its ability to pay the proffered wage as stated on the certified labor certification application and the underlying petition. 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 Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the USDOL.

The record contains the petitioner's business plan for the years 2007 through 2011. It also contains the petitioner's profit and loss statement prepared by its accountant for the year ending December 31, 2007. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) makes clear that where a petitioner relies on financial documents such as the profit and loss statement to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage, the financial statement must be audited. An audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards to obtain a reasonable assurance that the financial statements of the business are free of material misstatements. The unaudited profit and loss statement that the petitioner submitted is not persuasive evidence. The unsupported representations of management are not reliable evidence and are insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage.

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 *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 this case, the petitioner has not established an ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage through net income or net current assets. The petitioner also has not established its historical growth or its reputation within its industry. As indicated in the tax returns, the petitioner was able to pay the proffered wage of the beneficiary only in 2004 during the relevant period from 2001 through 2007. 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.

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.