

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

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**

PUBLIC COPY



B6

Date: **MAR 13 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)

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,
Elizabeth McCormack

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 a construction material testing firm.¹ It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a civil engineer, O*Net-SOC job code 17-2051.00 (Civil Engineers).² 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 denied the petition, finding 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 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 October 29, 2008 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.

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.³

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.

¹ The petitioner, according to its website [REDACTED] is registered as a Special Inspection Agency. It provides full quality assured QA/QC Field Engineering Inspections, AASHTO, CCRL, and NYS Agency Certified Material Testing Laboratory services. It also provides full NYSPE Certified Forensic and Design, Architectural, and Engineering Consulting Service.

² O*Net-SOC job code can be accessed online at [REDACTED] (last accessed February 13, 2011).

³ 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).

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

Further, 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 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 ETA Form 9089 as certified by the DOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

In the instant proceeding, the ETA Form 9089 was electronically filed for processing and accepted by the DOL on June 20, 2007. The rate of pay or the proffered wage specified on the ETA Form 9089 is \$65,582 per year. In the ETA Form 9089, the petitioner specifies that all job applicants, including the beneficiary, in order to qualify for the position should have at least a bachelor's degree in civil engineering and a minimum of 48 months (four years) of work experience in the job offered.

To show that the petitioner has the continuing ability to pay \$65,582 per year from June 20, 2007, the petitioner submitted the following evidence:

- Copies of Forms 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return for an S Corporation, for the years 2006 and 2007;⁴
- A copy of the beneficiary's Form W-2 for 2007; and
- A copy of [REDACTED] individual income tax return filed on a Form 1040, U.S. Individual Income Tax Return, for the year 2007;
- A letter dated November 24, 2008 from the petitioner's Certified Public Accountant (CPA) and tax preparer, [REDACTED] stating that the petitioner's net income and net current assets would have been much higher had the petitioner prepared the tax return using accrual basis, instead of cash basis.

⁴ The petitioner's tax return for the year 2006 will not be considered since the petitioner is only required to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date (June 20, 2007).

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as an S corporation. [REDACTED] is the sole stockholder (owner) of the corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established on March 30, 1992, to currently employ 19 people, and to have gross annual income and net annual income of \$1,276,340 and \$85,528, respectively.

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. 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).

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.

Based on the evidence submitted, the beneficiary received the following compensation from the petitioner in 2007:

<i>Tax Year</i>	<i>Actual wage (AW) (Box 1, W-2)</i>	<i>Yearly Proffered Wage (PW)</i>	<i>AW minus PW</i>
2007	\$24,142.50	\$65,582	(\$41,440.50)

Thus, in order for the petitioner to meet its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that it has the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date, the petitioner must show that it has the ability to pay \$41,440.50 in 2007. The petitioner can pay these amounts through either its net income or net current assets.

If the petitioner chooses to use its net income to pay the proffered wage during that period, USCIS will 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 September 22, 2008 upon receipt by the director of the petitioner's submission in response to the director's request for evidence. As of that date, the petitioner's 2008 federal income tax return was not yet available. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2007 is the most recent return available. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income (loss) for the year 2007, as shown below:

<i>Tax Year</i>	<i>Net Income (Loss)⁵ – in \$</i>	<i>The Remainder of the PW – in \$</i>
2007	9,000	41,440.50

Therefore, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the beneficiary’s proffered wage in 2007.

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.⁶ 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 its end-of-year net current assets for the year 2007, as shown below:

<i>Tax Year</i>	<i>Net Current Assets – in \$</i>	<i>The Remainder of the PW – in \$</i>
2007	(90,032)	41,440.50

Therefore, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage in 2007. Based on the net income and net current asset analysis above, the AAO agrees with the director that the petitioner does not have the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary receives legal permanent residence.

⁵ For an S Corporation, 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 if the S corporation’s income is exclusively from a trade or business. 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 23 (1997-2003) line 17e (2004-2005) line 18 (2006-2007) of Schedule K. See Instructions for Form 1120S, 2007, at [redacted] (last accessed May 18, 2011) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholder’s shares of the corporation’s income, deductions, credits, etc.). In the instant case, the net income in 2007 is found on line 18 of schedule K.

⁶ 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.

Additionally, the AAO observes, in adjudicating the appeal, that the petitioner has previously filed three immigrant petitions (Form I-140) for alien beneficiaries other than the beneficiary in the instant case since 2004. The table below shows the names of the alien beneficiaries, their immigration status (whether they are U.S. Legal Permanent Residence (LPR) or not), and the status of the petition:

No.	Receipt Number	Beneficiary's Last Name	Filing Date	Decision	Date of the Beneficiary's Adjustment to LPR
1.			10/27/11	Approved	Pending
2.			01/16/09	Approved	Pending
3.			01/12/04	Approved	Pending

If the instant petition were the only one filed by the petitioner, the petitioner would have only been required to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage to the single beneficiary of the instant petition. However, in this case, the petitioner has filed multiple petitions overlapping the time period for the current petition. Hence, the petitioner, consistent with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), is required to establish the ability to pay the proffered wages *not only* for the current beneficiary but *for all* of the other immigrant visa beneficiaries until each beneficiary receives his or her legal permanent residence (LPR).

On appeal, to show that the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage, Mr. and Mrs. submit a complete copy of their individual tax return for the year 2007. As noted earlier, is the owner of the petitioning corporation.

The AAO, however, cannot accept the owner's tax return as evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay. USCIS (legacy INS) has long held that it may not "pierce the corporate veil" and look to the assets of the corporation's owners 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 (Comm. 1980), and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980). In a similar case, 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." For these reasons, the AAO will not consider the gross adjusted income of the as evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay.

On appeal, counsel also submits a letter from the petitioner's CPA and tax preparer, indicating that the petitioner's net income and net current assets would have been much higher had the petitioner prepared the tax return using accrual basis, instead of cash basis. Using the accrual basis, states that the petitioner would have \$335,292 as net current assets as of December 31, 2007.

This office is not, however, persuaded by an analysis in which the petitioner seeks to rely on tax returns or financial statements prepared pursuant to one method but then seeks to shift revenue or expenses from one year to another as convenient to the petitioner's present purpose. If revenues are not recognized in a given year pursuant to the cash accounting method then the petitioner, whose taxes are prepared pursuant to cash rather than accrual, and who relies on its tax returns in order to show its ability to pay the proffered wage, may not use those revenues as evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage during that year. Similarly, if expenses are recognized in a given year, the petitioner may not shift those expenses to some other year in an effort to show its ability to pay the proffered wage pursuant to some hybrid of accrual and cash accounting.⁷ The amounts shown on the petitioner's tax returns shall be considered as they were submitted to the IRS, not as amended pursuant to the accountant's adjustments.

Finally, 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. 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.

We acknowledge that the petitioner is an ongoing business; however, the record is devoid of evidence regarding the petitioner's reputation. Unlike *Sonogawa*, however, the petitioner in this case has not provided any evidence reflecting the company's reputation or historical growth since its inception. Nor does it include any evidence or detailed explanation of its milestone achievements. Similarly, the tax records submitted do not reflect the occurrence of an

⁷ Once a taxpayer has set up its accounting method and filed its first return, it must receive approval from the IRS before it changes from the cash method to an accrual method or vice versa. [REDACTED] (accessed November 15, 2011).

uncharacteristic business expenditure or loss that would explain the petitioner's inability to pay the proffered wage particularly in 2007.

Assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, the AAO determines that the petitioner has failed to meet its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary receives permanent residence.

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.