

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
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090
**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**



B6

Date: JUN 01 2011 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
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:

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, 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, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained. The petition is approved.

The petitioner is a lamp factory.¹ It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States in a position entitled "shipping and receiving." As required by statute, the petition is

¹ The petitioner filed the labor certification under the name [REDACTED]. The Form I-140 petition was filed by [REDACTED] with an IRS Tax Number of [REDACTED]. The petitioner submitted, in support of its petition, tax returns filed by [REDACTED] who filed the returns under Employer Identification Number [REDACTED]. The address listed by [REDACTED] on Form I-140 and by [REDACTED] on its tax returns is [REDACTED] Valencia, CA 91355. In response to an AAO request for evidence, the petitioner submitted a copy of an "Agreement Of Merger" entered into on June 21, 2002 between [REDACTED] (Surviving Corporation) and [REDACTED] (Merging Corporation). Under the terms of that agreement, the two companies merged and the separate existence of the Merging Corporation ceased to exist on June 30, 2002. As of June 30, 2002, the Surviving Corporation succeeded to the properties, rights, privileges, powers, immunities, and franchises of the Merging Corporation. Under the terms of the agreement, all rights of creditors and all liens on the property of the Merging Corporation were to be preserved unimpaired, limited in lien to the property affected by any liens existing immediately before the merger. Evidence also shows that [REDACTED] does business as [REDACTED]. The tax returns of the Surviving Corporation, therefore, will be considered in assessing the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onward.

Matter of Dial Auto is an AAO decision designated as precedent by the Commissioner. *Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 481 (Comm. 1981). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions are binding on all USCIS employees in the administration of the Act. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a).

By way of background, *Matter of Dial Auto* involved a petition filed by Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc. (Dial Auto) on behalf of an alien beneficiary for the position of automotive technician. The beneficiary's former employer, Elvira Auto Body, filed the underlying labor certification. On the petition, Dial Auto claimed to be a successor-in-interest to Elvira Auto Body. The part of the Commissioner's decision relating to successor-in-interest issue is set forth below:

Additionally, the *representations made by the petitioner* concerning the relationship between Elvira Auto Body and itself are issues which have not been resolved. On order to determine whether the petitioner was a true successor to Elvira Auto Body, counsel was instructed on appeal to fully explain the manner

by which the petitioner took over the business of Elvira Auto Body and to provide the Service with a copy of the contract or agreement between the two entities; however, no response was submitted. If the *petitioner's claim* of having assumed all of Elvira Auto Body's rights, duties, obligations, etc., is found to be untrue, then grounds would exist for *invalidation of the labor certification under 20 C.F.R. § 656.30 (1987)*. Conversely, if the claim is found to be true, *and it is determined that an actual successorship exists*, the petition could be approved if eligibility is otherwise shown, including ability of the predecessor enterprise to have paid the certified wage at the time of filing.

(All emphasis added). The legacy INS and USCIS has, at times, strictly interpreted *Matter of Dial Auto* to limit a successor-in-interest finding to cases where the petitioner could show that it assumed all of the original entity's rights, duties, obligations and assets. However, a close reading of the Commissioner's decision reveals that it does not explicitly require a successor-in-interest to establish that it is assuming all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, in *Matter of Dial Auto*, the petitioner had *represented* that it had assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations, but had failed to submit requested evidence to establish that this was, in fact, true. And, if the petitioner's claim was untrue, the Commissioner stated that the underlying *labor certification* could be *invalidated for fraud or willful misrepresentation* pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.30 (1987).¹ This is why the Commissioner said "[i]f the petitioner's claim is found to be true, *and it is determined that an actual successorship exists*, the petition could be approved." (Emphasis added.) The Commissioner was explicitly stating that the petitioner's claim that it assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations is a separate inquiry from whether or not the petitioner is a successor-in-interest. The Commissioner was most interested in receiving a full explanation as to the "manner by which the petitioner took over the business of [the alleged predecessor] and seeing a copy of "the contract or agreement between the two entities."

In view of the above, *Matter of Dial Auto* did not state that a valid successor relationship could only be established through the assumption of all of a predecessor entity's rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, based on this precedent and the regulations pertaining to this visa classification, a valid successor relationship may be established if the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification; if the purported successor establishes eligibility in all respects, including the provision of evidence from the predecessor entity, such as evidence of the predecessor's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date; and if the petition fully describes and documents the transfer and assumption of the ownership of the predecessor by the claimed successor.

Evidence of transfer of ownership must show that the successor not only purchased the predecessor's assets but also that the successor acquired the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business in the same manner as the predecessor. The successor must continue to operate the same type of business as the predecessor, and the manner in which the business is controlled must remain substantially the same as it was before the ownership transfer. The successor must also establish its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from the date of business transfer until the beneficiary adjusts status to lawful permanent resident.

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 submitted all the initial required evidence to establish 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 denial, the issue in this case is whether or not 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)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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) states in pertinent part:

Ability of prospective employer to pay wage. Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The petitioner must also demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, as certified by the DOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on January 14, 2004. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$8.75 per hour (\$18,200 per year). The Form ETA 750 does not require any specific education, training or experience for the proffered position.

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.²

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as an S corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established on August 19, 1989 and to currently employ 131 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a fiscal year of July 1st to June 30th. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on July 1, 2003, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner since September 1989.

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 during any relevant timeframe including the period from the priority date in 2004 or subsequently. The petitioner states, on appeal, that it was submitting the W-2 Forms for the beneficiary, and that the beneficiary had been employed by the petitioner since 1989. Despite this statement, the petitioner, however, did not submit any evidence of wages paid to the beneficiary.

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

² 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).

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.

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. 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 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).

The record before the director closed on December 11, 2008 with the issuance of the director's decision denying the present petition. The director did not request additional evidence and denied the petition stating that the petitioner failed to submit any evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage with the submission of the Form I-140. The petitioner's tax returns are filed based on a fiscal year of July 1st to June 30th. As of that date of filing, August 21, 2007, 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 has, however, in response to an AAO request for evidence, submitted complete copies of its 2003 through 2009 tax returns. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2003 through 2009 as shown in the table below.

- In 2003,⁴ the Form 1120S (line 23, Schedule K) stated net income of (\$185,907).
- In 2004, the Form 1120S (line 17e, Schedule K) stated net income of \$472,034.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S (line 17e, Schedule K) stated net income of \$3,748,904.
- In 2006, the Form 1120S (line 18, Schedule K) stated net income of \$10,961,324.
- In 2007, the Form 1120S (line 18, Schedule K) stated net income of \$7,772,297.
- In 2008, the Form 1120S (line 18, Schedule K) stated net income of \$2,931,272.
- In 2009, the Form 1120S (line 18, Schedule K) stated net income of \$1,327,070.

Therefore, for the years 2004 through 2009, the petitioner's tax returns state sufficient net income to pay the full proffered wage of the present beneficiary. The petitioner's 2003 tax return does not state sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage of the present beneficiary. It is noted that [REDACTED] (the successor-in-interest to the petitioner) filed a Form I-129 for another worker on November 20, 2009, and a Form I-140 for another worker on July 10, 2007 with a priority date of May 8, 2007. Both petitions were approved by USCIS. The petitioner would need to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage for each I-140 beneficiary from the priority date until the beneficiary obtains permanent residence. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). Further, 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. The petitioner's net income for 2007 shows sufficient net income to pay the wages of all three sponsored workers.

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.⁵ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown

⁴ The 2003 tax return covers fiscal year July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004, which includes the January 14, 2004 priority date.

⁵ According 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.

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 end-of-year net current assets for 2003 through 2009, as shown in the table below.

- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$5,386,862.
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$3,296,147.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$3,174,559.
- In 2006, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$8,172,964.
- In 2007, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$8,836,016.
- In 2008, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$11,793,825.
- In 2009, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$12,090,671.

Therefore, for the years 2003 through 2009 tax years, the petitioner's tax returns show sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage of the present beneficiary and the additional sponsored workers.

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 (Reg. Comm. 1967). The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about \$100,000. During the year in which the petition was filed in that case, the petitioner changed business locations and paid rent on both the old and new locations for five months. There were large moving costs and also a period of time when the petitioner was unable to do regular business. The Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner's prospects for a resumption of successful business operations were well established. The petitioner was a fashion designer whose work had been featured in *Time* and *Look* magazines. Her clients included Miss Universe, movie actresses, and society matrons. The petitioner's clients had been included in the lists of the best-dressed California women. The petitioner lectured on fashion design at design and fashion shows throughout the United States and at colleges and universities in California. The Regional Commissioner's determination in *Sonogawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonogawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of a petitioner's net income and net current assets. USCIS may consider such factors as the number of years the petitioner has been doing business, the established historical growth of the petitioner's business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry, whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service, or any other evidence that USCIS deems relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In the instant case, the petitioner had substantial gross receipts during each relevant year (ranging from \$46,049,684 in 2003 to a high of \$115,895,625 in 2008; gross receipts in 2009 were \$92,805,966). Its net income and net current assets were substantial in all relevant years as well.

The petitioner's tax returns show that it paid worker salaries and officer compensation in excess of \$1,000,000 from 2003 onward. Assessing the totality of the circumstances, it is clear that the petitioner has the ability to pay the wage of the beneficiary, as well as an additional Form I-140 beneficiary from its May 8, 2007 priority date onward, as well as the wages of a Form I-129 worker.

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 met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The petition is approved.