

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 28 2011**

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



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:



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.

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 sustained. The petition will be approved.

The petitioner is an employment agency. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a data entry operator. As required by statute, ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL), accompanied the petition. 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 and 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 June 10, 2008 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 ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent 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 ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent 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 ETA Form 9089 was accepted on April 11, 2007. The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$13.25 per hour (\$27,560 per year). The ETA Form 9089 states that the position requires six months experience in 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.¹

The record indicates the petitioner is structured as a limited liability company and filed its tax returns on IRS Form 1065.² On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1999 and to currently employ 800 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on July 18, 2007, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one.³ Because the filing of

¹ The submission of additional evidence on appeal 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).

² A limited liability company (LLC) is an entity formed under state law by filing articles of organization. An LLC may be classified for federal income tax purposes as if it were a sole proprietorship, a partnership or a corporation. If the LLC has only one owner, it will automatically be treated as a sole proprietorship unless an election is made to be treated as a corporation. If the LLC has two or more owners, it will automatically be considered to be a partnership unless an election is made to be treated as a corporation. If the LLC does not elect its classification, a default classification of partnership (multi-member LLC) or disregarded entity (taxed as if it were a sole proprietorship) will apply. *See* 26 C.F.R. § 301.7701-3. The election referred to is made using IRS Form 8832, Entity Classification Election. In the instant case, the petitioner, a multi-member LLC, is considered to be a partnership for federal tax purposes.

³ The petitioner is an employment agency. Thus, the AAO inquired as to the bona fides of the job offer to the beneficiary (i.e. where the beneficiary would work, copies of contracts under which the beneficiary would work, who would pay the beneficiary and control the work of the beneficiary, etc.). In response to the request for evidence, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary would be employed directly by the petitioner at its principal business location and paid the proffered wage of \$13.25 per hour. The petitioner further stated that the beneficiary would not work under contract for any other entity, and that the petitioner would have direct control and supervision of the beneficiary's work. Under these stated conditions, it appears that the petitioner would be the actual employer of the beneficiary.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(c) provides that “[a]ny United States employer desiring and intending to employ an alien may file a petition for classification of the alien under...section

203(b)(3) of the Act.” In addition, the Department of Labor (DOL) regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.3³ states:

Employer means a person, association, firm, or a corporation which currently has a location within the United States to which U.S. workers may be referred for employment, and which proposes to employ a full-time worker at a place within the United States or the authorized representative of such a person, association, firm, or corporation.

In determining whether there is an “employee-employer relationship,” the Supreme Court of the United States has determined that where a federal statute fails to clearly define the term “employee,” courts should conclude “that Congress intended to describe the conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine.” *Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. v. Darden*, 503 U.S. 318, 322-323 (1992) (hereinafter “*Darden*”) (quoting *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. 730 (1989)). That definition is as follows:

In determining whether a hired party is an employee under the general common law of agency, we consider the hiring party's right to control the manner and means by which the product is accomplished. Among the other factors relevant to this inquiry are the skill required; the source of the instrumentalities and tools; the location of the work; the duration of the relationship between the parties; whether the hiring party has the right to assign additional projects to the hired party; the extent of the hired party's discretion over when and how long to work; the method of payment; the hired party's role in hiring and paying assistants; whether the work is part of the regular business of the hiring party; whether the hiring party is in business; the provision of employee benefits; and the tax treatment of the hired party.

Darden, 503 U.S. at 323-324; *see also* Restatement (Second) of Agency § 220(2) (1958); *Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates, P.C. v. Wells*, 538 U.S. 440 (2003) (hereinafter “*Clackamas*”). As the common-law test contains “no shorthand formula or magic phrase that can be applied to find the answer, ... all of the incidents of the relationship must be assessed and weighed with no one factor being decisive.” *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324 (quoting *NLRB v. United Ins. Co. of America*, 390 U.S. 254, 258 (1968)).

In considering whether or not one is an “employee,” U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) must focus on the common-law touchstone of control. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. Factors indicating that a worker is an “employee” of an “employer” are clearly delineated in both the *Darden* and *Clackamas* decisions. 503 U.S. at 323-324; *see also* Restatement (Second) of Agency § 220(2) (1958). Such indicia of control include when, where, and how a worker performs the job; the continuity of the worker's relationship with the employer; the tax treatment of the worker; the provision of employee benefits; and whether the work performed by the worker is part of the

employer's regular business. *See Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; *cf.* New Compliance Manual, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, § 2-III(A)(1), (EEOC 2006) (adopting a materially identical test and indicating that said test was based on the *Darden* decision).

It is important to note that the factors listed in *Darden* and *Clackamas* are not exhaustive and must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Other aspects of the relationship between the parties may affect the determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists. Furthermore, not all or even a majority of the listed criteria need be met; however, the fact finder must weigh and compare a combination of the factors in analyzing the facts of each individual case. The determination must be based on all of the circumstances in the relationship between the parties, regardless of whether the parties refer to it as an employee or as an independent contractor relationship. *See Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; New Compliance Manual at § 2-III(A)(1).

In *Clackamas*, the specific inquiry was whether four physicians, actively engaged in medical practice as shareholders, could be considered employees to determine whether the petitioner to qualify as an employer under the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), which necessitates an employer have fifteen employees. The court cites to *Darden* that “We have often been asked to construe the meaning of ‘employee’ where the statute containing the term does not helpfully define it.” *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 444, (citing *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 318, 322). The court found the regulatory definition to be circular in that the ADA defined an “employee” as “individual employed by the employer.” *Id.* (citing 42 U.S.C. § 12111(4)). Similarly, in *Darden*, where the court considered whether an insurance salesman was an independent contractor or an “employee” covered by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), the court found the ERISA definition to be circular and adopted a common-law test to determine who would qualify as an “employee under ERISA.” *Id.* (citing *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 323). In looking to *Darden*, the court stated, “as *Darden* reminds us, congressional silence often reflects an expectation that courts will look to the common law to fill gaps in statutory text, particularly when an undefined term has a settled meaning in common law. Congress has overridden judicial decisions that went beyond the common law.” *Id.* at 447 (citing *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324-325).

The *Clackamas* court considered the common law definition of the master-servant relationship, which focuses on the master’s control over the servant. The court cites to definition of “servant” in the Restatement (Second) of Agency § 2(2) (1958): “a servant is a person employed to perform services in the affairs of another and who with respect to the physical conduct in the performance of services is subject to the other’s control or right to control.” *Id.* at 448. The Restatement additionally lists factors for consideration when distinguishing between servants and independent contractors, “the first of which is ‘the extent of control’ that one may exercise over the details of the work of the other.” *Id.* (citing § 220(2)(a)). The court also looked to the EEOC’s focus on control in *Skidmore v. Swift & Co.*, 323 U.S. 134, 140 (1944) and that the EEOC considered an employer can hire and fire employees, assign tasks to employees and supervise their performance, can decide how the business’ profits and losses are distributed. *Id.* at 449-450.

an ETA Form 9089 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA Form 9089, 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 states that the beneficiary has not worked for the petitioner.

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 (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 wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

In *K.C.P. Food*, 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*, 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 April 30, 2008 with the receipt by the director 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 is the most recent return available. The petitioner submitted its 2007 tax return in response to the director’s request for evidence, and its 2008 and 2009 tax return on appeal in response to the AAO’s request for evidence. The petitioner’s tax returns stated its net income as detailed in the table below.

In 2007, the petitioner’s Form 1065 stated net income of (\$188,101).⁴

⁴ For an LLC taxed as a partnership, where a partnership’s income is exclusively from a trade or business, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 22 of page one of the petitioner’s Form 1065, U.S. Partnership Income Tax Return. However, where a partnership has income, credits, deductions or other adjustments from sources other than a trade or business, they are reported on Schedule K. If the Schedule K has relevant entries for additional income or additional credits, deductions or other adjustments, net income is found on pages 4 (before 2008) and page 5 (2008-2010) of IRS Form 1065 at line 1 of the Analysis of Net Income (Loss) of Schedule K. See Instructions for Form 1065, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1065.pdf> (accessed May 19, 2011) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all partners’ shares of the partnership’s income, deductions, credits, etc.). In the instant case, the petitioner’s Schedules K for 2007 through 2009 have relevant entries for additional income, credits, deductions, and/or other adjustments, therefore, its net income is found on line 1 of the Analysis of Net Income (Loss) of Schedule K of its tax returns.

- In 2008, the petitioner's Form 1065 stated net income of (\$101,239).
- In 2009, the petitioner's Form 1065 stated net income of (\$220,925).

Therefore, for the years 2007 through 2009, the petitioner did not establish that it had sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

It is further noted that USCIS records indicate that the petitioner has filed six other Form I-140 and additional I-129 petitions for other workers. Therefore, 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'l Comm'r 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 750 and ETA Form 9089). *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In response to the AAO's request for evidence, the petitioner provided a list of its seven total sponsored I-140 workers and W-2 Forms for some of the workers to demonstrate its ability to pay the wages of those workers. According to information provided by the petitioner, it presently has three sponsored workers in its employ. It previously employed two other workers who left its employ in 2010 and 2011. The W-2 Forms provided show that some of the workers were paid the full proffered wage. No W-2 Forms were provided for one worker, and the W-2 Forms of another worker show that he was paid less than the proffered wage. No explanation was offered for not submitting W-2 Forms for one worker or why another worker appeared to have been paid less than his full proffered wage. It should be further noted that the W-2 Forms provided show the sponsored workers were paid by [REDACTED] (Employer Identification Number (EIN) - [REDACTED]⁵ The petitioner in this instance is [REDACTED] with an EIN of [REDACTED] and this is the entity that would employ and pay the beneficiary.

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. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.⁶ A partnership's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1(d) through 6(d) and include cash-on-hand, inventories, and receivables expected to be converted to cash within one year. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 15(d) through 17(d). If the total of a partnership's end-of-year net current assets and

⁵ The petitioner states that [REDACTED] is the payroll company for the petitioner.

⁶ 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.

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 stated its net current assets as detailed in the table below.

- In 2007, the petitioner's Form 1065 stated net current assets of (\$191,556).
- In 2008, the petitioner's Form 1065 stated net current assets of (\$102,808).
- In 2009, the petitioner's Form 1065 stated net current assets of (\$219,140).

Therefore, for the years 2007 through 2009, the petitioner did not establish that it had sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage of the present beneficiary or the wages of other sponsored workers.

Thus, from the date the Form ETA 9089 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, its net income or net current assets.

On appeal, the petitioner states that it has had the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onward. Specifically, the petitioner states that its tax returns reflect negative figures because it prepares its returns on a "cash" accounting basis. The petitioner states that its true financial position should be determined from its financial statements. In support of its appeal, the petitioner submitted copies of April 2007 to May 2008 (payroll account) checking account statements for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] copies of April 2007 to May 2008 (operating account) checking account statements for [REDACTED] and copies of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return (Form 941) for quarter ending June 2007 through March 2008.

The petitioner indicates on appeal that its unaudited financial statement, rather than its tax returns, is a more accurate instrument to consider in determining its ability to pay the proffered wage because its tax returns are based on a "cash" accounting basis. The AAO does not agree. The fact that the petitioner's returns were prepared on a cash basis rather than an accrual basis does not make them poor indices of the funds available to the petitioner with which to pay wages. Although tax returns prepared pursuant to cash basis accounting may not facilitate comparing various years to each other, they are at least as good an indicator of the funds that were available to the petitioner during a given year as are returns prepared pursuant to accrual basis of accounting. The petitioner's tax returns were prepared pursuant to the cash method of accounting, in which revenue is recognized when it is received, and expenses are recognized when they are paid. See <http://www.irs.gov/publications/p538/ar02.html#d0e1136> (accessed March 28, 2011). This office would, in the alternative, have accepted tax returns prepared pursuant to accrual method of accounting, if those were the tax returns the petitioner had actually submitted to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).

This office is not, however, persuaded by an analysis in which the petitioner, or anyone on its behalf, seeks to rely on tax returns or financial statements prepared pursuant to one method, but then seeks to shift revenue or expenses from one year to another as convenient to the petitioner's present purpose. If revenues are not recognized in a given year pursuant to the cash accounting method then the petitioner, whose taxes are prepared pursuant to cash rather than accrual, and who relies on its tax returns in order to show its ability to pay the proffered wage, may not use those revenues as evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage during that year. Similarly, if expenses are recognized in a given year, the petitioner may not shift those expenses to some other year in an effort to show its ability to pay the proffered wage pursuant to some hybrid of accrual and cash accounting.⁷ The amounts shown on the petitioner's tax returns shall be considered as they were submitted to the IRS.

Further, contrary to the assertions of the petitioner, the unaudited financial reports for the petitioner are not viewed as sound evidence in an ability to pay analysis. 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. The accountant report accompanying the 2006 and 2007 combined financial statements of the petitioner clearly states that all information contained in the statements are the representations of management and that the statements are not audited. The unsupported representations of management are not reliable evidence and are insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage.

As set forth above, the petitioner submitted, on appeal, copies of checking account statements from the petitioner and [REDACTED]. First, [REDACTED] would appear to be a separate legal entity from the petitioner and would be under no legal obligation to pay the proffered wage. Because a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders, the assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm'r 1980). In a similar case, the court in *Sitar v. Ashcroft*, 2003 WL 22203713 (D.Mass. Sept. 18, 2003) stated, "nothing in the governing regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 204.5, permits [USCIS] to consider the financial resources of individuals or entities who have no legal obligation to pay the wage." Second, 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. Third, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. Finally, no evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the funds reported on the petitioner's bank statements somehow reflect

⁷ Once a taxpayer has set up its accounting method and filed its first return, it must receive approval from the IRS before it changes from the cash method to an accrual method or vice versa. *See* <http://www.irs.gov/publications/p538/ar02.html#d0e2874> (accessed March 28, 2011).

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.

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.

Considering the totality of the circumstances in the instant case, the petitioner's tax returns show both substantial gross receipts and substantial growth in its receipts as follows:

- 2007 - \$14,337,010
- 2008 - \$27,357,788
- 2009 - \$22,994,832

According to the Form I-140, the petitioner has been in business since 1999 and employs 800 people. The petitioner's tax returns show substantial wages paid to employees, and costs of labor:

Wages	Costs of Labor
• 2007 - \$911,106	\$10,860,008
• 2008 - \$2,087,064	\$21,008,597
• 2009 - \$1,532,763	\$17,893,622

Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this particular case, the length of time the petitioner has been in business, its number of employees, the growth and the substantial nature of its gross receipts and wages paid, and based upon the foregoing, it is concluded that it is more likely than not that the petitioner has maintained the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage of all sponsored workers from the priority date onward. The appeal shall be sustained. The petition shall be approved.

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 that burden.

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