



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)

Date: JUN 06 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:

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 with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a 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,

*Kenna S. Forbes for*

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 an accounting firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an administrative assistant. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, 'Application for Permanent 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 and 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 March 19, 2009 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)(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 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).

Here, the ETA Form 9089 was accepted on January 23, 2007. The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$17.16 per hour (\$35,692.80 per year based on 40 hours per week).

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 sole proprietorship. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established August 16, 1999 and to currently employ two workers. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on March 29, 2007, the beneficiary did not claim to currently work for the petitioner.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA 9089 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA 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'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 demonstrated that it paid the beneficiary wages as shown in the table below:

- In 2007, the IRS Form W-2 shows wages paid of \$8,910.
- In 2008, the IRS Form W-2 shows wages paid of \$35,710.

For the year 2008, the petitioner has established that it paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage. The petitioner paid the beneficiary less than the proffered wage in 2007. Thus, the petitioner must demonstrate that it can pay the difference between wages actually paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage in 2007 which is \$26,782.80.

---

<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).

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).

The petitioner is a sole proprietorship, a 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 their dependents. *See Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

In *Ubeda*, 539 F. Supp. at 650, the court concluded that it was highly unlikely that a petitioner could support himself, his spouse and five dependents on a gross income of slightly more than \$20,000 where the beneficiary's proposed salary was \$6,000 or approximately thirty percent (30%) of the petitioner's gross income.

In the instant case, the sole proprietor supports a family of four. The proprietor's tax returns reflect that the proprietor's adjusted gross income for 2007 is \$78,330.<sup>2</sup>

In 2007, the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income exceeds the difference between the wages paid and the prevailing wage. However, the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income would also be expected to support his family of four. The petitioner provided an estimate of expenses for his family as represented in the table below:

Mortgage payment:	\$1,760.00
Association fee – HOA:	\$305.19
Telephone & cell:	\$175.00
Market/grocery:	\$495.00

---

<sup>2</sup> The proprietor's adjusted gross income is found on line 37 of IRS Form 1040.

(b)(6)

Insurance:	\$122.33
Auto Gas:	\$120.00
Utilities – power:	\$156.00
Clothing & barber:	\$85.00
Miscellaneous & gifts:	\$140.00

The proprietor's total estimated monthly expenses would be \$3,358.52. However, the petitioner's estimate of monthly expenses is inconsistent with the evidence in the record.

The petitioner's estimate listed a monthly mortgage payment expense of \$1,760. However, a statement in the record dated September 2, 2008 from [REDACTED] indicates that the proprietor's monthly mortgage payment is \$2,690.63. Further, the proprietor's 2007 federal income tax return indicates that the petitioner owns rental property. The tax return further indicates that rental income received for 2007 was \$3,720. The cost of the rental property's mortgage, taxes, insurance, advertising and repairs totaled \$19,712. After income, the rental property's cost was \$15,992. That cost was not included in the petitioner's estimate. The petitioner's estimate did not include a car payment. The record contains a statement dated February 1, 2009 from Honda Financial Services indicating regular monthly payments on a 2007 Honda Odyssey are paid in the amount of \$497.74.

The petitioner's estimate did not include taxes. The proprietor's 2007 federal income tax return reflects federal income taxes owed of \$11,861, state income taxes of \$1,284 and personal property tax of \$298. The petitioner's estimate did not include gifts to charity. The proprietor's 2007 federal income tax return reflects \$12,920 in gifts to charity. The petitioner's estimate did not include water and utilities. The record contains a bill from the [REDACTED] for January 2009 in the amount of \$140.64.

Incorporating these additional expenses into the petitioner's estimate would increase the estimated monthly expenses from \$3,358.52 to \$5,284.63 or \$63,415.56 per year. In addition, the proprietor would have expenses for the year for taxes, gifts to charity and costs of rental property totaling \$42,355.

The proprietor's expenses exceed the proprietor's adjusted gross income leaving a deficit to pay the proffered wage. It is improbable that the sole proprietor could support a family of four on a deficit.

On appeal, counsel asserts that discretionary expenses should not have been included in the analysis. However, counsel did not specify which expenses were discretionary or explain why they should not have been included in the analysis of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.<sup>3</sup> The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

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

<sup>3</sup> Counsel asserts on appeal that he will file a brief within 30 days. To date, the AAO has received nothing further from counsel regarding the instant appeal.

(Reg'l Comm'r 1967). The petitioning entity in *Sonegawa* 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 *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 has been in business since 1999 and has two employees. The petitioner has minimal gross income and minimal wages paid to all employees. No evidence was provided to explain any temporary or uncharacteristic disruption in its business activities. No evidence was provided to establish an outstanding reputation in the industry comparable to the petitioner in *Sonegawa*. No evidence was provided to document that the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service. 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.

Further, USCIS records indicate that the petitioner has filed several petitions since the petitioner's establishment in 1999, including I-129 petitions and I-140 petitions. The petitioner would need to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage for each I-140 beneficiary from the priority date until the beneficiary obtains permanent residence. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). Further, the petitioner would be obligated to pay each H-1B petition beneficiary the prevailing wage in accordance with DOL regulations, and the labor condition application certified with each H-1B petition. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.715.

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.