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 0 2 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 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 restaurant which seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cook. As required by statute, the Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Parts A & B, 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. The director also determined the petitioner had not submitted evidence to establish that the petitioner was the corporate entity that actually intended to employ the beneficiary.

The decision in this matter will be made based on our finding that the petitioner has established that it is the corporate entity that intends to employ the beneficiary. This determination is based, in part, by a letter dated March 24, 2008 from counsel explaining that the petitioner placed the wrong IRS Employer Identification Number (EIN) number on the Form I-140 and specifying that the correct the identifier for the petitioner's restaurant located at

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 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 October 6, 2003 shows the proffered wage as $12.46 per hour which equates to $25,916.80 per year and that the position requires two years experience in the job offered or "any cook" position.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

The petitioner was structured as a C corporation in 2003 with a fiscal year from October 1 through September 30 and as an S corporation in 2004 through 2006 with a fiscal year based on a calendar year. On its tax returns, it claims it was established in 2001 and on the Form I-140, it indicates it employed 42 workers when the petition was filed. On the Form ETA 750, Part B, statement of qualifications of alien, signed by the beneficiary on September 22, 2003, she stated she had not 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 Sonegawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

USCIS first examines whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary from the priority date onwards. A finding that the petitioner employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage is considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay. The record contains no evidence that the petitioner has employed the beneficiary to date. Therefore, it has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date of October 6, 2003 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. 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*, 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 USCIS 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 March 25, 2008 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 2007 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2006 was the most recent return available. The tax returns demonstrate net income as follows:

Year	Net Income
2003 [1]	$114,347 [2]

[1] For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the IRS Form 1120.

[2] Although the tax return is for 2003, it pertains to the corporation's tax year beginning October 1, 2003 and ending September 30, 2004.

2004 [3]	-$1,934 [4]
2005	$214,760
2006	$224,540

Therefore, for the last quarter of 2004, 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.[5] A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If the total of a corporation's end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate net current assets as follows:

Year	Net Current Assets ($)
2003	-$93,923
2004	-$69,648
2005	-$62,772
2006	-$29,165

For the years 2003 through 2006, 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.

---

[3] Where an S corporation's income is exclusively from a trade or business, USCIS considers net income to be the figure for ordinary income, shown on line 21 of page one of the petitioner's IRS Form 1120S. However, where an S corporation 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, credits, deductions or other adjustments, net income is found on line 17e (2004-2005) or line 18 (2006) of Schedule K. *See* Instructions for Form 1120S at http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf.

[4] The 2004 Form 1120S appears to represent a three month period (October 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004).

[5] 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.

On appeal, counsel states that the director erred while refusing altogether to consider the fact that as a trade name operates a number of locations with more than 400 employees in two states and the District of Colombia. Counsel further states that the joint ownership of all these restaurants, the fact that they use identical menus and advertise and have "for hire" ads on the same web site are all probative facts which support a conclusion that, by preponderance of the evidence, the petitioner in the instant case can pay the proffered wage. Counsel argues that the fact that the petitioner may have fallen short to establish its ability to pay through its tax returns for a period of time, it should be considered in the broader context of numerous locations, employment of more than 400 people, and combined gross revenue approaching 30 million dollars.

Counsel forwards a letter from dated September 18, 2008. explained that the petitioner is a single-purpose entity that is closely affiliated with other corporations by name and through family affiliations. Counsel also forwards a letter dated September 18, 2008 from e explaining the history and affiliations of the various corporations. Counsel submits a letter dated September 19, 2008 from Associates in Alexandra, Virginia, confirming the number of employees at eleven separate companies that he considers to occupy locations. Finally, counsel also submits fact sheets about the various locations composing the together with information on "rewards and accolades."

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). 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."

USCIS may not "pierce the corporate veil" and look to the assets of the corporation's owner to satisfy the corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. It is an elementary rule that a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders. *See Matter of M*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958), *Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530, and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980). Consequently, 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.

Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax returns as submitted by the petitioner that demonstrate the corporation could not continuously 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 company has been existent for a length of time which parallels the 11 years of operation in *Sonegawa*. However, the corporation has not established its individual historical growth, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, its individual reputation within the industry or whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service. It is also noted that the petitioner has filed multiple petitions for additional beneficiaries that were pending during the requisite period. 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 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.