





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services


(b)(6)



Date: Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

JUN 22 2012

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 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,

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 Italian restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an Italian specialty cook. 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 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.

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

As set forth in the director's January 20, 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 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.

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).

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 March 28, 2005. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$15.00 per hour (\$31,200 per year.) The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires two years of experience in the job offered.

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 in 2002 and to currently employ 4 workers. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on June 24, 2006, 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 Sonegawa*, 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 2005 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), *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 (7th 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 only himself.² The proprietor's tax returns reflect the following information for the following years:

| | <u>2005</u> | <u>2006</u> | <u>2007</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Proprietor's adjusted gross income (Form 1040, line 37) | \$22,555 | \$33,757 | 32,583 |

In 2006, the sole proprietor's adjusted gross income of \$22,555 fails to cover the proffered wage of \$31,200. It is improbable that the sole proprietor could support himself on a deficit, which is what remains after reducing the adjusted gross income by the amount required to pay the proffered wage. Additionally, for years 2007 and 2008, after paying the proffered wage, the sole proprietor would have \$2,557 and \$1,383 respectively, to support himself. These figures are not taking into account the sole proprietor's monthly personal expenses of \$3,765.

Counsel made no assertions on appeal, but only submitted additional information to show ability to pay. Counsel submitted the following:

- Balance sheets, for years ending 2005, 2006, and 2007;

² According to the 2008 personal monthly expenses, the petitioner pays child support in the amount of \$1,000 per month.

- Account summary for a 529 College Tuition Savings Plan, [REDACTED] for years 2005, 2006, and 2007, with year-end balances of \$2,960.91, \$5,680.19, and \$7,988.81 respectively;
- Commercial Loan with a balance due of \$19,999.26, with an unknown holder;
- Roth IRA portfolio summary for 2006 and 2007, showing year-end balances of \$4,254.66 and \$8,701.90 respectively;
- Loan balance summary for loan with [REDACTED] showing a balance due of \$9,932.43;
- Commercial checking account statements showing year-end balances for 2006, 2007, and 2008 as \$44.72, \$306.45, and \$106.35, respectively;
- Account summary for what appears to be a Certificate of Deposit account with [REDACTED] Direct, from January 1, 2007 to February 18, 2009, showing a balance of \$18,703.78; and
- Business checking account statements from [REDACTED] showing the balance year-end balances for 2005, 2006, and 2007, of \$2,548.23, \$5,427.31, and \$8,405.75 respectively.

As in the instant case, where the petitioner has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage in the priority date year or in any subsequent year based on its adjusted gross income (AGI), the proprietor's statements must show an initial average annual balance, in the year of the priority date, exceeding the full proffered wage. Subsequent statements must show annual average balances which increase each year after the priority date year by an amount exceeding the full proffered wage. The average annual balances of the petitioner's two business/commercial checking accounts in the years 2005, 2006, and 2007 are not sufficient to cover the full proffered wage. Thus, the sole proprietor's cash assets as reflected in his checking account, certificate of deposit account, or IRA account do not establish the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

The sole proprietor has not asserted that he would be willing to take withdrawals from the IRA account to pay the proffered wage. Withdrawals from a traditional IRA before age 59 ½ are considered early withdrawals. The age of the petitioner is undetermined. However, if the sole proprietor is under age 59 ½ in each relevant year, and he takes an early withdrawal from a traditional IRA, then in addition to any regular federal income or state income tax due on the withdrawal, the he may also be required to pay a 10% tax penalty, with certain exceptions. *See* 26 U.S.C. § 72(t); 26 U.S.C. § 408. Withdrawals from Roth IRAs that are taken before the individual is 59 1/2 *and* before the account has been open for 5 calendar years may be taxed as ordinary income and may also be subject to the additional 10% early withdrawal penalty, with certain exceptions. *See* 26 U.S.C. § 72(t); 26 U.S.C. § 408A. Therefore, even before taking into account the tax burden that would result from the sole proprietor's proposed early IRA withdrawals, the balances in the years 2006 and 2007 are not sufficient to cover the full proffered wage.

With regard to the 529 College Tuition Savings Plan, with what appears to be the petitioner's son as the beneficiary. According to the Pennsylvania website at <http://www.pa529.com/save-gsp-works.html>, the Pennsylvania 529 Guaranteed Savings Plan is a lower-risk college savings vehicle that lets an individual save for higher education without navigating the ups and downs of the stock and bond markets. When used for qualified expenses, the growth in the account is not subject to

federal or state income taxes. However, the availability of tax or other benefits may be contingent on meeting other requirements. A withdrawal or a portion of a withdrawal not used to pay for qualified expenses may be subject to federal income tax and a 10% federal penalty tax, as well as state and local income taxes. The petitioner has not asserted that he is willing to withdraw from this college savings plan in order to meet the ability to pay.

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*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (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.

The record does not contain any newspapers or magazine articles, awards, or certifications indicating the company's milestone achievements. Unlike *Sonegawa*, the petitioner in this case has not shown any evidence reflecting the company's reputation or historical growth since its inception in 2002. Nor has the petitioner presented evidence of any uncharacteristic business expenses or losses contributing to its inability to pay the proffered wage. 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.

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).

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has also not established that the beneficiary is

qualified for the offered position. The petitioner must establish that the beneficiary possessed all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the priority date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). See *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977); see also *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg'l Comm'r 1971). In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. See *Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant*, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm'r 1986). See also, *Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered position requires two years of experience as an Italian specialty cook. On the labor certification, the beneficiary claims to qualify for the offered position based on experience as an Italian specialty cook with Raffallo's Pizza, Italian Restaurant, in Zacapa, Guatemala, but did not list dates of employment.

The beneficiary's claimed qualifying experience must be supported by letters from employers giving the name, address, and title of the employer, and a description of the beneficiary's experience. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(A) The record contains a letter from the sole proprietor, Eddie Rene Rosales Lira., on Raffalo's Pizza letterhead, stating the company employed the beneficiary for a period of two years. However, the letter does not provide the address of the employer; describe the duties in detail; specify the dates of employment; or state if the job was full-time.

The evidence in the record does not establish that the beneficiary possessed the required experience set forth on the labor certification by the priority date. Therefore, the petitioner has also failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified for the offered position.

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.