

(b)(6)

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

DATE: **SEP 14 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:

[REDACTED]

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 in accordance with the instructions on 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, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a farm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a farm equipment mechanic. 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 6, 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.

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 August 14, 2006. The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$21,986 per year.

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

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a limited liability company (LLC). On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 2000 and to currently employ 4 workers. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on March 27, 2007, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner since March 16, 2000.

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. I 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. I 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, no evidence was submitted of wages paid to the beneficiary. Therefore, the petitioner has not established that it paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage during any relevant timeframe including the period from the priority date of August 14, 2006 onward.

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

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).

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).

An LLC is an entity formed under state law by filing articles of organization. An LLC may be classified for federal income tax purposes as if it were a sole proprietorship, a partnership or a corporation. If the LLC has only one owner, it will automatically be treated as a sole proprietorship by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) unless an election is made to be treated as a corporation. If the LLC has two or more owners, it will automatically be considered to be a partnership by the IRS unless an election is made to be treated as a corporation. If the LLC does not elect its classification, a default classification of partnership (multi-member LLC) or disregarded entity (taxed as if it were a sole proprietorship) will apply. See 26 C.F.R. § 301.7701-3. The election referred to is made using IRS Form 8832, Entity Classification Election. In the instant case, the petitioner, an LLC formed under Texas law, is considered to be a sole proprietorship for federal tax purposes. An LLC, like a corporation, is a legal entity separate and distinct from its owners. The debts and obligations of the company generally are not the debts and obligations of the owners or anyone else.² An investor's liability is limited to his or her initial investment. As the owners and others only are liable to his or her initial investment, the total income and assets of the owners and others and their ability, if they wished, to pay the company's debts and obligations, cannot be utilized to demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must show the ability to pay the proffered wage out of its own funds.

LLCs taxed as sole proprietorships report income and expenses from their businesses on their individual member's (Form 1040) federal tax return each year. The business-related income and expenses are reported on the member's Schedule C.

The record before the director closed on December 29, 2008 with the receipt by the director of the petitioner's submissions in response to the director's request for evidence. As of that date, the petitioner's 2008 federal tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2007 would have been the most recent return available. However, on appeal, the petitioner submitted copies of its federal tax returns for 2008 to 2010. The petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2006 to 2010, as shown in the table below.³

- In 2006, the petitioner's 1040 Schedule C stated net profit of \$22,903.
- In 2007, the petitioner's 1040 Schedule C stated net profit of \$29,102.
- In 2008, the petitioner's 1040 Schedule C stated net profit of \$24,266.
- In 2009, the petitioner's 1040 Schedule C stated net profit of \$12,198.
- In 2010, the petitioner's 1040 Schedule C stated net profit of \$16,086.

² Although this general rule might be amenable to alteration pursuant to contract or otherwise, no evidence appears in the record to indicate that the general rule is inapplicable in the instant case.

³ Net income is found on the member's IRS Form 1040, Schedule C, at Line 31.

For the years 2006 to 2008, the petitioner has established that it had sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage. For the years 2009 to 2010, the petitioner did not establish that it had sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner's bank account contained sufficient funds each month to pay the proffered wage. Copies of monthly bank statements were submitted for 2006, 2007, 2008 and January 2009. However, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. ^ 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. Further, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. In addition, 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 returns.

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 (Reg I Comm r 1967). 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.

In the instant case, the petitioner has been in business since 2000 and has four employees. The submitted evidence indicates that the petitioner's gross receipts declined each year from 2006 to 2009. The petitioner paid minimal wages to all employees in each relevant year. No evidence was provided to explain any temporary or uncharacteristic disruption in its business activities. Further, no evidence was provided to establish an outstanding reputation in the industry comparable to the petitioner in *Sonogawa*. 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.

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.