

(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 28 2012** OFFICE: TEXAS 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,

Kerrin Forbes for

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed the decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner describes itself as an auto repair shop. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as an auto mechanic. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a professional or skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A). The petition is accompanied by a labor certification approved by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The director's decision denying the petition concludes that the petitioner did not submit the required initial evidence with the petition and that the evidence does not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the April 30, 2001 priority date.

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

On appeal, counsel informed the AAO that the petitioner is no longer in business and that the beneficiary is now employed by a different, unrelated, employer.² The instant appeal is therefore moot.

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 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).

² Counsel asserts that pursuant to the American Competitiveness in the Twenty-First Century Act of 2000 (AC21), the beneficiary's Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status, could be "continued" based on the beneficiary's employment in a similar position as an auto mechanic with a new employer, [REDACTED] d/b/a/ [REDACTED]. However, the AAO does not agree that the terms of AC21 make it so that the instant *immigrant petition* can be approved despite the fact that the petitioner has not demonstrated its eligibility. AC21 allows an *application for adjustment of status* to be approved despite the fact that the initial job offer is no longer valid. The language of AC21 states that the I-140 "shall remain valid" with respect to a new job offer for purposes of the beneficiary's application for adjustment of status despite the fact that he or she no longer intends to work for the petitioning entity provided (1) the application for adjustment of status based upon the initial visa petition must have been pending for more than 180 days and (2) the new job offer the new employer must be for a "same or similar" job. A plain reading of the phrase "will remain valid" suggests that the petition must be valid *prior* to any consideration of

Ability to Pay the Proffered Wage

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, 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).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on April 30, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$12.27 per hour (\$25,521.60 per year).

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as a C corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1999, to have a gross annual income of \$800,000 and to have a net annual income of \$48,000. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the Form ETA 750B, 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

whether or not the adjustment application was pending more than 180 days and/or the new position is same or similar. In other words, it is not possible for a petition to remain valid if it is not valid currently. The AAO would not consider a petition wherein the initial petitioner has not demonstrated its eligibility to be a valid petition for purposes of section 106(c) of AC21. This position is supported by the fact that when AC21 was enacted, USCIS regulations required that the underlying I-140 was approved prior to the beneficiary filing for adjustment of status. When AC21 was enacted, the only time that an application for adjustment of status could have been pending for 180 days was when it was filed based on an approved immigrant petition. Therefore, the only possible meaning for the term "remains valid" was that the underlying petition was approved and would not be invalidated by the fact that the job offer was no longer a valid offer. See *Matter of Al Wazzan*, 25 I&N Dec. 359 (AAO 2010).

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. The petitioner submitted IRS Forms 1099-MISC issued to the beneficiary as follows:

- In 2001, nonemployee compensation of \$13,520.00.
- In 2002, nonemployee compensation of \$13,600.00.
- In 2003, nonemployee compensation of \$13,600.00.
- In 2004, nonemployee compensation of \$14,000.00.
- In 2005, nonemployee compensation of \$14,500.00.
- In 2006, nonemployee compensation of \$15,000.00.
- In 2007, nonemployee compensation of \$26,000.00.
- In 2008, nonemployee compensation of \$20,000.00.

In the instant case, the petitioner has established that it paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage in 2007. The petitioner has not established that it paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2008. Therefore, it must establish that it can pay the difference between the proffered wage and the wages paid to the beneficiary in each of those years.

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). Reliance on the petitioner's gross sales and profits and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross sales and profits 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 the Service 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).

For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The record before the director closed on November 29, 2007. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2006 is the most recent return available. The petitioner did not submit its tax returns, audited financial statements or annual reports for 2001, 2002, 2005 and 2006. Further, the 2004 tax return submitted on appeal is marked "DO NOT FILE" and does not appear to be the tax return the petitioner filed with the Internal Revenue Service.³

³ *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988) (stating that doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition). The AAO notes that the 2004 tax return does not state sufficient net income to pay the difference between wages paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage, and because Schedule L was not submitted with the return, the petitioner's net current assets cannot be determined.

Thus, the AAO will not accept the petitioner's 2004 tax return as evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner's 2003 Form 1120 stated net income of \$5,153.00.

Therefore, for the years 2001 to 2006, the petitioner did not establish that it had sufficient net income to pay the difference between wages paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage.

If the net income the petitioner demonstrates it had available during that period, if any, added to the wages paid to the beneficiary during the period, if any, do not equal the amount of the proffered wage or more, USCIS will review the petitioner's net current assets. Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.⁴ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6 and include cash-on-hand. 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 2003 Form 1120 stated end-of-year net current assets of \$4,464.00.

Therefore, for the years 2001 to 2006, the petitioner did not establish that it had sufficient net current assets to pay the difference between wages paid to the beneficiary and proffered wage.

Therefore, from the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL, 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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that it has been unable to obtain the petitioner's tax records for years other than 2003 and 2004. The non-existence or other unavailability of required evidence creates a presumption of ineligibility. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(2)(i).

Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax returns as submitted by the petitioner that demonstrates that the petitioner could not pay the proffered wage from the day the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by the DOL.

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'l 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

⁴According 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.

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 not established the historical growth of its business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry, or whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service. The petitioner is no longer in business. 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.

Labor Certification Does Not Support Classification as a Skilled Worker

Beyond the decision of the director, the submitted Form ETA 750 does not support classification under the skilled worker provisions. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of 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. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii), provides for the granting of preference classification to other qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

Here, the Form I-140 was filed on November 29, 2007. On Part 2.e. of the Form I-140, the petitioner indicated that it was filing the petition for a professional or a skilled worker.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l) provides in pertinent part:

(4) Differentiating between skilled and other workers. The determination of whether a worker is a skilled or other worker will be based on the requirements of training and/or experience placed on the job by the prospective employer, as certified by the Department of Labor.

In this case, the labor certification indicates that an applicant must have six years of grade school education and six years of high school education. There are no training or experience requirements for the proffered position.⁵ However, the petitioner requested the skilled worker classification on the Form I-140. The evidence submitted does not establish that the petition requires at least two years of training or experience such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker. Further, the petitioner did not submit evidence to establish that the beneficiary had the required six years of grade school education and six years of high school education.⁶ Thus, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary is qualified for the proffered position.

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).

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.

⁵ It appears that there was previously an experience requirement of undetermined length. However, it was removed by the DOL regional office on March 20, 2007, prior to the March 21, 2007 certification.

⁶ The petitioner must 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).