


(b)(6)

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



DATE: **DEC 08 2012**

OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER


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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

*Rachel Antonio*  
for

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a retail bakery. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a baker. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely, and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's August 27, 2009 denial, the single 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)(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) 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 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on July 30, 2004. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$16,000.00 per year. The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the job offered of baker.

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 evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a C corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 2007,<sup>2</sup> to have a gross annual income of \$160,000.00, and to currently employ one worker. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year begins on August 1<sup>st</sup> and ends on July 31<sup>st</sup>. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on July 27, 2004, 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. 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'l Comm'r 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'l Comm'r 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary during that period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date in 2004 onwards. One Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statement for wages paid by the petitioner to the beneficiary was submitted, which indicated that the beneficiary was paid \$18,200.00 in 2008.

---

<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 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).

<sup>2</sup> Although the petitioner indicated on the Form I-140 that it was established on June 22, 2007, the petitioner's tax returns indicate that it was incorporated on August 26, 2003.

As the proffered wage is \$16,000.00 per year, the petitioner did not pay the beneficiary the proffered wage in 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 and would be obligated to demonstrate its ability to pay the difference between wages it actually paid and the proffered wage as shown in the table below.

Year	Proffered Wage	Wages Paid	Balance
2003	\$16,000.00	\$0	\$16,000.00
2004	\$16,000.00	\$0	\$16,000.00
2005	\$16,000.00	\$0	\$16,000.00
2006	\$16,000.00	\$0	\$16,000.00
2007	\$16,000.00	\$0	\$16,000.00
2008	\$16,000.00	\$18,200.00	\$0

The record also contained copies of the front of two checks from [REDACTED] dated November 30, 2007 and December 28, 2007, respectively, which do not appear to have been paid and processed by a bank. Both checks lack the bank codes, which would indicate that they were in fact paid, and the back sides of the checks were not shown. Thus, these two checks are not sufficient evidence of wages paid to the beneficiary by 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 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 2009); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010), *aff'd*, No. 10-1517 (6th Cir. filed Nov. 10, 2011). Reliance on federal income tax returns as a basis for determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is well established by judicial precedent. *Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava*, 632 F. Supp. 1049, 1054 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) (citing *Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F.2d 1305 (9th Cir. 1984)); *see also Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Texas 1989); *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. 1080 (S.D.N.Y. 1985); *Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7th Cir. 1983). Reliance on the petitioner's gross sales and profits and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross sales and profits exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. at 1084, the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now USCIS, had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns, rather than the petitioner's gross income. The court specifically rejected the argument that the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. *See Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 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).

For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The record before the director closed on August 24, 2009 with the receipt by the director of the petitioner’s submissions in response to the director’s request for evidence (RFE). As of that date, the petitioner’s 2009 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner’s income tax return for 2008 is the most recent return available. The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007, as shown in the table below.

- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$763.00.
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$2,025.00.
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$15,545.00.
- In 2007, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$12,144.00.

Therefore, for the years 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

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 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

---

<sup>3</sup>According to *Barron’s Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 2000), “current assets” consist

current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6 and include cash-on-hand. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If the total of a corporation's end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets for 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007, as shown in the table below.

- In 2004, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$7,852.00.
- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$5,799.00.
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$1,612.00.
- In 2007, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$7,561.00.

Therefore, for the years 2004, 2005, 2006, and 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 DOL, the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets.

On appeal, counsel cites 81 No. 29 *Interpreter Releases* 961 and asserts that USCIS should consider: 1) a combination of methods to determine ability to pay, 2) the petitioner's ratio of assets to liabilities, and 3) the amount of depreciation added to taxable income. Counsel also states that USCIS should consider the petitioner's "current net assets," which counsel defines as capital stock plus retained earnings.

The AAO notes that it is bound by the Act, agency regulations, precedent decisions of the agency and published decisions from the circuit court of appeals within the circuit where 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).

In addition, counsel confuses assets and liabilities with current assets and current liabilities in asserting that 81 No. 29 *Interpreter Releases* 961 states that the "ratio of assets to liabilities" should be considered. This document refers to principles established in the minutes of the Eastern Service Center (ESC)/AILA Liaison Teleconference of November 16, 1994 where the then-director of the

---

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.

ESC stated that, if the taxable income is negative even though the beneficiary is not yet employed by the petitioner, the ESC will generally assume that the petitioner is able to handle the additional salary if, according to its tax return, it has a favorable enough ratio of total "current assets to total current liabilities."

The AAO is never bound by a decision of a service center or district director. *See Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra vs. INS*, 44 F. Supp. 2d 800, 803 (E.D. La. 2000), *aff'd*, 248 F. 3d 1139 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S.Ct. 51 (2001).

Counsel recommends the use of retained earnings to pay the proffered wage. Retained earnings are a company's accumulated earnings since its inception less dividends. Joel G. Siegel and Jae K. Shim, *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 378 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 2000). As retained earnings are cumulative, adding retained earnings to net income and/or net current assets, or to capital stock as counsels suggests, is duplicative. Therefore, USCIS looks at each particular year's net income, rather than the cumulative total of the previous years' net incomes less dividends represented by the line item of retained earnings.

Further, even if considered separately from net income and net current assets, retained earnings might not be included appropriately in the calculation of the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage because retained earnings do not necessarily represent funds available for use. Retained earnings fall under the heading of shareholder's equity on Schedule L of the petitioner's tax returns and generally represent the non-cash value of the company's assets. Thus, retained earnings do not generally represent current assets that can be liquidated during the course of normal business. Similarly, capital stock also may not be included appropriately in the calculation of the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage because capital stock does not necessarily represent funds available for use. Capital stock falls under the heading of shareholder's equity on Schedule L of the petitioner's tax returns and generally represents the total amount of stock authorized for issue by a corporation (including common and preferred stock) or the total stated or par value of the permanently invested capital of a corporation. Thus, capital stock does not generally represent current assets that can be liquidated during the course of normal business.

The AAO notes that the record contains a copy of the petitioner's June 2009 bank statement. Counsel's reliance on the balance in the petitioner's bank account is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), required to illustrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. While this regulation allows additional material "in appropriate cases," the petitioner in this case has not demonstrated why the documentation specified at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) is inapplicable or otherwise paints an inaccurate financial picture of the petitioner. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage.

The AAO notes that the record contains a letter dated August 19, 2009 from [REDACTED] the owner of the petitioner's business, in which he states that: 1) he is willing to forego his own salary in order to pay the beneficiary, if necessary, and 2) he has always planned for the beneficiary to replace another baker on the staff, [REDACTED] further states that, as soon as the beneficiary

is allowed to work permanently, the other employee will stop working. The petitioner submitted copies of Forms W-2 reflecting wages paid to its owner, [REDACTED] for 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008 as well as Forms W-2 reflecting wages paid to I [REDACTED] for 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008.

The AAO notes that the record does not include sufficient evidence of [REDACTED] ability to forego wages and still support himself and any dependents. No evidence of his personal financial status was submitted, including copies of his personal tax returns and recurring monthly household expenses. 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)).

Counsel advised that the beneficiary will replace one worker. The record names this worker and states her wages, but the record does not, however, verify her full-time employment or provide sufficient evidence that the petitioner has replaced or will replace her with the beneficiary. In general, wages already paid to others are not available to prove the ability to pay the wage proffered to the beneficiary at the priority date of the petition and continuing to the present. Moreover, there is no evidence other than the petitioner's statement that the position of [REDACTED] involves the same duties as those set forth in the ETA 750. The petitioner has not documented the position, duty, and termination of the worker who performed the duties of the proffered position. If that employee performed other kinds of work, then the beneficiary could not have replaced her.<sup>4</sup>

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 DOL.

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'l Comm'r 1967). The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about \$100,000.00. 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

---

<sup>4</sup> The purpose of the instant visa category is to provide employers with foreign workers to fill positions for which U.S. workers are unavailable. If the petitioner is, as a matter of choice, replacing U.S. workers with foreign workers, such an action would be contrary to the purpose of the visa category and could invalidate the labor certification. However, this consideration does not form the basis of the decision on the instant appeal.

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 *Sonegawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonegawa*, 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's gross receipts during the relevant years varied as did the amount of wages paid. The petitioner indicated on the Form I-140 that it employs one person, although the Forms W-2 submitted indicated that two individuals (including the owner) were paid during 2004 through 2008. Salaries and wages were not substantial. The petitioner does not pay substantial compensation to its owner. The petitioner did not submit evidence sufficient to demonstrate that its owner was able to forego officer compensation in order to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage. In addition, there is no evidence in the record of the historical growth of the petitioner's business, of the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses from which it has since recovered, or of the petitioner's reputation within its industry. Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

The evidence submitted does not establish that the petitioner had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date.

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

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.