

**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 **FEB 02 2012** Office: TEXAS 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)



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, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an "auto mechanic shop" which seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an auto mechanic. As required by statute, the Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien 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.

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 Form ETA 750 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 Form ETA 750 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 Form ETA 750 that was accepted for processing on April 30, 2001 shows the proffered wage as \$21.50 per hour which equates to \$44,720 per year. 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 2000 and to

employ no workers when the petition was filed.¹ Its IRS Forms 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Returns, and IRS Forms 1120-A, U.S. Corporation Short-Form Income Tax Return, reflect it operates on a tax year basis beginning November 1 and ending October 31. On the Form ETA 750, Part B, statement of qualifications of alien, signed by the beneficiary on October 9, 2006, he did not state he had been employed by the petitioner.

A certified labor certification establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the Form ETA 750. 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 Sonogawa*, 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. The beneficiary's IRS Forms W-2 for 2008, 2009 and 2010 show compensation received from the petitioner, as shown in the table below.

2008	2009	2010
\$13,728	\$14,976	\$15,080

In this case, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date of April 30, 2001 and onwards.

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 receipts and wage expense is misplaced.

¹ The block on the Form I-140 filed on January 16, 2008 at Part 5, Item # 2 requesting the "Current Number of Employees" was left blank by the petitioner.

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 and on Line 24 of the IRS Form 1120-A. The record closed on October 18, 2011 with the receipt of the petitioner's submission in response to the AAO's September 9, 2011 Request for Evidence (RFE). As of that date, the petitioner's 2010 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2009 was the most recent return available. The petitioner's IRS Forms 1120 and 1120-A tax returns demonstrate its net income for the years of the requisite period below:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Net Income</u>
2000	-\$4,352
2001	-\$164
2002	-\$6,041
2003	-\$4,599
2004	-\$1,339
2005	-\$2,896
2006	\$4,365
2007	\$1,615
2008	-\$9,893
2009	\$21,769

Therefore, for the years 2000 through 2009, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

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.² A corporation filing Form 1120 reports its year-end current assets on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. A corporation filing Form 1120-A reports its year-end current assets on Part III, lines 1 through 6, and its current liabilities on lines 13 and 14. The petitioner's IRS Forms 1120 and 1120-A tax returns demonstrate its net current assets for the years of the requisite period below:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Net Current Assets</u>
2000	-\$6,724
2001	-\$6,888
2002	-\$22,522
2003	-\$27,788
2004	-\$44,297
2005	-\$47,790
2006	\$0 ³

²According 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.

³ Although the petitioner did not report any assets on its 2006 Form 1120-A, it reported \$30,640 in inventories on column (b) of its 2007 Form 1120. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

2007	\$43,010 ⁴
2008	-\$12,963
2009	\$0

Therefore, for the years 2000 through 2009, 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 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.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a statement from a person with an indiscernible signature from an organization named the [REDACTED] dated November 17, 2008. The writer asserts that the petitioner had not proven its ability to pay from 2001 to 2007 because the company accountant was unavailable and the petitioner could not obtain its corporate tax returns for those years. The writer asserts that the petitioner always had enough "high gross income" to pay the proffered wages to the beneficiary during those years. However, there is no evidence in the record supporting these claims. Unsupported assertions do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The petitioner also submits an unaudited balance sheet and profit and loss statement for a twelve month period ending October 31, 2007. The petitioner's reliance on unaudited financial records 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. Even if this unaudited financial statement was considered, it would not establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage because it shows the petitioner only had \$2,223.56 in net income for the twelve month period, far short of the proffered wage.

The petitioner submits business bank statements from 2005, 2006, and 2007 as evidence of the corporation's ability to pay. The petitioner's reliance on the balances in its bank accounts is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R.

⁴ Although the petitioner claimed to have end-of-year current assets of \$43,010 in 2007, it claimed to have no beginning-of-year assets in 2008 (column (b) of Schedule L). Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho, id.*

§ 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. 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).

The petitioner'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 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 Sonegawa*. The petitioning entity in *Sonegawa* 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 *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 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. The AAO concludes that the petitioner has not demonstrated adequate financial strength to demonstrate its ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. It is noted that the petitioner filed one more Form I-140 for an additional worker since April 30, 2001, under receipt number [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]). The company's request that this petition be approved is weakened because petitioners must produce evidence that its job offers to each beneficiary are realistic and that it has the ability to pay the proffered wages to all 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, supra*,

(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. *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). 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.