

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: Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

JUN 24 2011

FILE:

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, 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 dismissed.

The petitioner is an importer and wholesaler of motorcycle parts which seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a "Tatami" craft artist. 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 provides new documentation for consideration. 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. § 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 31, 2006, shows the proffered wage as \$9.53 per hour (\$19,822.40 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 petitioner is structured as a C corporation and claims to have been established in 2003 and to employ 3 workers when the petition was filed. Its IRS Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Returns, reflect it operates on a tax year basis beginning July 1 and ending June 30.

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 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. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on January 19, 2007, he did not claim to have worked for the petitioner. On his Form G-325A, Biographic Information, the beneficiary signed on August 14, 2007, he stated he had not been employed for at least the last five years.

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 31, 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 (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 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*, *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 February 25, 2009 with the receipt of the petitioner’s submissions in response to the director’s request for evidence. As of that date, the petitioner had submitted its 2005 federal income tax return and the return for 2008 was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner’s income tax return for 2007 was the most recent return available. Although the director had requested the petitioner’s 2006 and 2007 federal income tax returns in his Request for Evidence dated January 14, 2009, they were not submitted for the record. The petitioner’s initially submitted IRS Form 1120 tax return for 2005 demonstrates its net income for the year was \$6,297.00.

The petitioner appealed the director’s decision to the AAO on May 1, 2009, arguing that the evidence to establish the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wages consisting of amended federal and state tax returns for 2005, 2006 and 2007 had *just now* (emphasis supplied) become available and were not available at the time of responding the director’s earlier request. The amended tax returns listed net income as \$32,897 for 2005, \$28,199 for 2006 and \$29,778 for 2007. It was only after the visa petition was denied by the director on March 30, 2009 and on appeal that the company submitted an amended 2005 federal tax return showing a \$26,600 increase in net income “Due to negotiation with customers, sales amount was revised.” It is determined the petitioner’s first federal tax return for 2005 is more credible than the second return for 2005 which substantially raised the company’s net income.

Therefore, for its 2005 tax year beginning July 1, 2005, ending June 30, 2006, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner did not submit its original tax returns for 2006 and 2007. Both of the amended returns for those years also carried the statement “Due to negotiation with customers, sales amount was revised.” Each piece of relevant evidence is examined and determinations are made as to whether such evidence, either by itself or when viewed within the totality of the evidence, establishes that something to be proved is probably true. Truth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone, but by its quality. *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77 (Comm’r 1989). A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm’r 1988). Further, the amended federal tax returns show no evidence of submission to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) or their receipt or acceptance by the IRS. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm’r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg’l Comm’r 1972)). Thus, the AAO will only consider the original version of the

petitioner's federal tax returns for 2005 that was initially submitted as credible and not the amended versions that were submitted on appeal.

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>1</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. Because the corporation's total receipts for the tax year and its total assets at the end of the tax year were less than \$250,000, the company was not required to complete Schedule L and did not do so. Therefore, for the year 2005, the petitioner's Schedule L could not be analyzed to see if it reflected sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage.<sup>2</sup>

<u>Year</u>	<u>Net Current Assets</u>
2005	No Schedule L
2006	\$375,047 <sup>3</sup>
2007	\$485,726

Therefore, for the year 2005, (and probably for 2006 and 2007 as well), the petitioner has not established that it had 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.

As noted by the director in his decision dated March 30, 2009, 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

---

<sup>1</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>2</sup> It is noted that the petitioner's "amended" 2005 tax return submitted on appeal included a completed Schedule L and a total asset valuation in Block D on page 1 of the Form 1120. It is unclear why the petitioner would have completed Schedule L in this matter given its representations in the original version of its tax return. In any event, USCIS will not consider this amended return in evaluating the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage for the reasons set forth above.

<sup>3</sup> Although the petitioner's net current assets appear substantial in 2006 and 2007, these amounts cannot be relied upon because the petitioner listed unusually high figures on its Schedule L, line 2b "less allowance for bad debts" of \$599,215 in 2006 and \$531,637 in 2007, causing distorted net current asset sums. The AAO also does not consider these "amended" returns reliable for the reasons outlined above.

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(s), 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.

Also, as noted by the director in the March 30, 2009 decision, the petitioner's reliance on the company's unaudited balance sheets for 2006, 2007 and 2008 is misplaced. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) makes clear that where a petitioner relies on financial statements to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage, those financial statements must be audited. As there is no accountant's report accompanying these statements, the AAO cannot conclude that they are audited statements. Unaudited financial statements are the representations of management. The unsupported representations of management are not reliable evidence and are insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage.

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 *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, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, or its reputation within its industry. Therefore, the AAO concludes that the petitioner has not demonstrated adequate financial strength through its net current income, net current assets, or any other means to demonstrate its ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. 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.