

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

[Redacted]

B6

Date: **FEB 02 2012** Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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:

[Redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,


Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a cleaning and maintenance service. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an administrative officer. 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 July 15, 2009, denial, the issue raised in the denial of 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 April 30, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$13.23 per hour (\$27,518.40 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the position offered as an administrative officer.

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 evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner operated as a sole proprietor from 2001-2004, and then incorporated in 2005 as a C corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1987, to have a gross annual income of \$1,622,000, and to currently employ thirteen workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is the calendar year. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on October 10, 2007, it is unclear whether the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner.²

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.³

¹ 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).

² Form ETA 750B, Block 15, details the beneficiary's claimed work experience. While the form does not contain any information regarding the beneficiary's employment history, there is a handwritten reference to an attachment. No attachment to Form ETA 750B is found in the record of proceeding.

³ On appeal, the petitioner submitted pay stubs covering a period starting on May 1, 2009, and up to July 31, 2009. In a letter dated August 11, 2009 and submitted with the appeal, the petitioner states

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 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).

The record indicates that from 2001-2004, the petitioner operated as a sole proprietorship.⁴ A sole proprietorship is business in which one person operates the business in his or her personal capacity. Black's Law Dictionary 1398 (7th Ed. 1999). Unlike a corporation, a sole proprietorship does not exist as an entity apart from the individual owner. See *Matter of United Investment Group*, 19 I&N Dec. 248, 250 (Comm'r 1984). Therefore the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income, assets and personal liabilities are also considered as part of the petitioner's ability to pay. Sole proprietors report income and expenses from their businesses on their individual (Form 1040) federal tax return each year. The business-related income and expenses are reported on Schedule C and are carried forward to the first page of the tax return. Sole proprietors must show that they can cover their existing business expenses as well as pay the proffered wage out of their adjusted gross income or other available funds. In addition, sole proprietors must show that they can sustain themselves and

that the beneficiary began employment with the petitioner "earlier this year." Based on this evidence, it appears that the beneficiary is paid twice a month, with pay periods ending on the fifteenth and last day of the month, at a rate of \$1,120 per pay period. If consistently paid at this rate, the yearly wage would be \$26,880, which is still short of the proffered wage.

⁴ Although not submitted with the instant petition, the petitioner submitted its 2001 and 2007 tax returns with another Form I-140 for the same beneficiary. Therefore, these tax returns will be included in the record of proceeding.

their dependents. *See Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7th Cir. 1983).

The petitioner provided no evidence of its personal monthly obligations for the period in which it was structured as a sole proprietorship.⁵ However, based up on its IRS Form 1040s provided in the record, we see the following:

- In 2001, the Form 1040 stated adjusted gross income of \$46,254.
- In 2002, the Form 1040 stated adjusted gross income of \$19,724.
- In 2003, the Form 1040 stated adjusted gross income of \$25,924.
- In 2004, the Form 1040 stated adjusted gross income of \$23,564.

Based on the above, the petitioner did not have sufficient adjusted gross income in 2002-2004 to pay the proffered wage. Although the petitioner's adjusted gross income exceeded the proffered wage in 2001, it is not realistic that the sole proprietorship could pay the proffered wage and still meet the owner's personal obligations, which include supporting a family of five on \$18,735.60.

In 2005, it appears from the record that the petitioner changed structure, becoming [REDACTED], and began to file taxes as a C corporation.⁶ For C corporations, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The

⁵ The Form 1040s indicate that the petitioner's owner supported a family of five in 2001, and a family of four in subsequent years.

⁶ Beyond the decision of the director, the appellant also failed to establish that it is a successor-in-interest to the entity that filed the petition and labor certification. A labor certification is only valid for the particular job opportunity stated on the application form. 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(c). If the appellant is a different entity than the petitioner/labor certification employer, it must establish that it is a successor-in-interest to that entity. *See Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 481 (Comm. 1986).

An appellant may establish a valid successor relationship for immigration purposes if it satisfies three conditions. First, the successor must fully describe and document the transaction transferring ownership of all, or a relevant part of, the predecessor. Second, the successor must demonstrate that the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification. Third, the successor must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it is eligible for the immigrant visa in all respects.

The evidence in the record does not satisfy all three conditions described above because it does not fully describe and document the transaction transferring ownership of the predecessor and it does not demonstrate that the claimed successor is eligible for the immigrant visa in all respects, including whether it and the predecessor possessed the ability to pay the proffered wage for the relevant periods. Accordingly, the petition must also be denied because the appellant has failed to establish that it is a successor-in-interest to the petitioner/labor certification employer.

record before the director closed on December 26, 2007, with the receipt of the petitioner's Form I-140 filing. As of that date, the petitioner's 2008 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2007 is the most recent return available. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2005-2007, as shown in the table below.

- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$1,927.
- In 2006, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$33,555.
- In 2007, the Form 1120 stated net income of \$28,195.

Therefore, in 2005, 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.⁷ A corporation's year-end 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 return demonstrates its end-of-year net current assets for 2005, as shown in the table below.

- In 2005, the Form 1120 stated net current assets of \$4,326.

Here again, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage in 2005.⁸

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, in a letter from the petitioner, it asserts that its short fall in 2001 was due to business expansion and the purchase of vehicles. However, no documentation was provided which would allow evaluation or substantiation of that claim. In fact, the vehicle expenses reported on Form

⁷According 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.

⁸ From 2001-2004 the petitioner was a sole proprietorship, and data necessary to calculate assets, including audited balance sheets, was not provided.

1040, Schedule C for the petitioner were less in 2001 than in 2002 and 2003. No attempt to explain short falls in other years was provided.⁹

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. 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, during the time the petitioner was a sole proprietor, it does not appear that it had the resources to pay for the personal needs and obligations of the proprietor and the proffered wage. Although the petitioner asserts that this was due to expansion costs no evidence of these costs was provided. Further, this argument does not explain subsequent short falls. Additionally, no evidence was supplied by the petitioner that shows it had access to additional resources, or had an exceptional reputation that ensured its survival through a temporary downturn or expansion. Nothing in the record indicates why the tax returns do not paint an accurate financial picture. We note that the beneficiary claimed to employ 13 people, and in 2006 claimed to pay \$37,626 in wages and salaries. The proffered wage in the instant case is 73% of total wages paid by the petitioner. In order to

⁹ On appeal, counsel asserts that "8 years ago, in 2001, the petitioner would not have been required to pay the prevailing wage." This assertion is incorrect. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), the petitioner has the obligation to establish that it has the continued ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date until the beneficiary adjusts status.

satisfy the proffered wage, the petitioner would need to nearly double its salary expenditure. 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 and continuing to the present.

As noted above, the AAO conducts review of all petitions on a *de novo* basis. An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. See *Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); see also *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

The petitioner must demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its labor certification application, 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). In the instant petition, the Form ETA 750 requires two years of experience in the proffered position. On the Form ETA 750B, the beneficiary did not list any prior experience. As noted earlier, there is a hand written notation referencing an attachment, however no attachment was included with the record. The only evidentiary support for the beneficiary's claimed work experience came from one experience letter from [REDACTED]. This letter states that the beneficiary was employed there from March 1987 to November 1989 as an administrative officer. No other description of the beneficiary's work experience or training was provided.

Although the letter confirms that the beneficiary was employed, it falls short of the regulatory requirements. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3) provides:

(ii) *Other documentation—*

(A) *General.* Any requirements of training or experience for skilled workers, professionals, or other workers must be supported by letters from trainers or employers giving the name, address, and title of the trainer or employer, and a description of the training received or the experience of the alien.

From the letter it is impossible to discern the job duties and work performed by the beneficiary during this claimed employment. Any additional evidence of the beneficiary's experience provided in future filings must meet the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3).

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.