




(b)(6)



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services




DATE: APR 04 2013 OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE: 

IN RE: Petitioner: 
Beneficiary: 

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i)

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 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,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting 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 garment contractor. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a tailor. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification (labor 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, 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 7, 2012 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 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 ETA Form 9089 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 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977).

Here, the ETA Form 9089 was accepted on February 28, 2011. The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$30,160.00 per year. The ETA Form 9089 states that the position requires 24 months of experience in the job offered.

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 an S corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1989² and to currently employ 23 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on June 8, 2011, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner beginning on February 10, 2001.³

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA Form 9089 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA Form 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).

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).

² The petitioner's tax returns state it incorporated on December 6, 2004. The California Secretary of State's website states that the petitioner was incorporated on December 6, 2004. See <http://kepler.sos.ca.gov> (accessed March 20, 2013). This suggests the petitioner commenced operations in 2004, not 1989, as alleged. The petitioner must explain this inconsistency in any further filings.

³ As previously discussed, the petitioner appears to have commenced operations in 2004. This casts doubt on the beneficiary's claimed employment with the petitioner, or that employment would have occurred prior to its existence. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's evidence may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988). It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent, objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Id.*

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 \$2,722.00⁴ in 2011, which is \$27,438.00 less than the proffered wage. Thus, the petitioner must demonstrate that it can pay the difference between wages actually paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage in 2011.

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 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

⁴ The \$2,722.00 salary figure is stated on the pay stub for the pay period ending December 23, 2011 as a year-to-date amount of pay. The AAO notes that these low wages suggest that the beneficiary is not employed by the petitioner full-time in the position offered as alleged on the labor certification. The job offer must be for a permanent and full-time position. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 656.3; 656.10(c)(10). DOL precedent establishes that full-time means at least 35 hours or more per week. *See* Memo, Farmer, Admin. for Reg'l. Mngm't., Div. of Foreign Labor Certification, DOL Field Memo No. 48-94 (May 16, 1994). While the petitioner is not obligated to employ the beneficiary in the position offered until the beneficiary obtains permanent residence, the beneficiary's claim of full-time employment in the position offered contrasted with the actual wages paid casts doubt on whether there is a bona fide full-time job offer. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's evidence may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988). The petitioner must address this inconsistency in any further filings.

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 March 15, 2012 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 2012 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2011 is the most recent return available.⁵ The petitioner's 2011 tax return stated net income⁶ of (\$7,906.00). Therefore, for 2011, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the difference between the proffered wage and the wages paid to the beneficiary.

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.⁷ A corporation's year-end current assets are shown

⁵ The record also contains the petitioner's 2010 tax return, which precedes the priority date. This tax return will be discussed in the totality of the circumstances below.

⁶ Where an S corporation's income is exclusively from a trade or business, 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.

⁷ According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3rd ed. 2000), "current assets" consist

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 2011 tax return stated end-of-year net current assets of (\$1,052.00). Therefore, for 2011, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the difference between the proffered wage and the wages paid to the beneficiary.

Therefore, from the date the ETA Form 9089 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.

Counsel asserts on appeal that the petitioner's bank records demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage. Counsel's reliance on the balance in the petitioner's bank account is misplaced. First, 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. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. In this case, the record contains a copy of the petitioner's bank statement which states a beginning balance on December 30, 2011 of \$2,722.52 and an ending balance on January 31, 2012 of \$12,776.79, which is insufficient to show the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage for 2011. Third, 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 return(s), such as the petitioner's taxable income (income minus deductions) or the cash specified on Schedule L considered above in determining the petitioner's net current assets.

On appeal, counsel cites the court's decision in *Construction and Design Co. v. USCIS*, 563 F.3d 593 (7th Cir. 2009), in support of counsel's claim that the petitioner's tax returns are the poorest method to show an employer's ability to pay the proffered wage. The AAO does not find the court's decision in *Construction and Design* to be particularly supportive or persuasive of the petitioner's position in this case. The facts of *Construction and Design* are distinguishable from the instant facts in that *Construction and Design* dealt with the conversion of an independent contractor to a permanent employee. *Id.* at 596. This matter did not arise with the same circuit as *Construction and Design*. The AAO is bound by the Act, agency regulations, precedent decisions of the agency and published decisions from the circuit court of appeals from whatever circuit that the action arose. *See N.L.R.B. v. Ashkenazy Property Management Corp.*, 817 F.2d 74, 75 (9th Cir. 1987). Additionally, the court's

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.

holding in *Construction and Design* affirmed the district court's decision in denying the work visa sought by the petitioner. *Id.* at 598.

Counsel asserts that because the petitioner paid \$141,000 to subcontractors in 2011, this amount is available to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage. Counsel seems to claim that the petitioner has the ability to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage as the beneficiary will take the place of one or more of the subcontractors. However, the record does not name these workers, state what their wages were, verify their full-time employment and the dates of their employment, or provide evidence that the petitioner has replaced or will replace any of them with the beneficiary. In general, wages already paid to others are not available to prove the ability to pay the wage proffered to the beneficiary at the priority date of the petition and continuing to the present. Moreover, there is no evidence that the work of these subcontractors involves the same duties as those set forth in the Form ETA Form 9089.

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 ETA Form 9089 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 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 states on the Form I-140 that it has been in business since 1989; however, the California Secretary of State and the petitioner's tax returns state it was not incorporated until 2004. The petitioner indicates on the Form I-140 that it employs 23 workers; however, the salaries paid in 2011 are relatively low and indicative of part-time employment. The

record reflects negative net income and negative net current assets for 2011. The only evidence in the record pertaining to the petitioner's historic business growth is its tax return for 2010, before the priority date in February 2011, but this demonstrates negative net income and low net current assets. A comparison of the 2010 and 2011 tax returns demonstrates that the amount in the petitioner's gross receipts decreased in 2011. The record does not contain any evidence of the petitioner's reputation in the industry. 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.

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. Comm. 1977); *see also Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 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 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 24 months of experience in the job offered, tailor. On the labor certification, the beneficiary claims to qualify for the offered position based on experience as a tailor for [REDACTED] from August 4, 1995 to February 10, 2001 and as a tailor for [REDACTED] from December 15, 1994 to July 30, 1995.

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 an affidavit from one of the beneficiary's former co-workers regarding the beneficiary's employment at [REDACTED] but this does not meet the above regulatory requirements of an experience letter because it is not from the employer. The record contains a letter from the owner of the business [REDACTED] which states that the beneficiary worked as a sewing machine operator at [REDACTED] from May 1988 through October 1995, and at [REDACTED] beginning in November 1995 when the name of the company was changed. The record contains a letter from this same individual, dated December 3, 1996, which seems to state that the name of [REDACTED] was changed to [REDACTED] in September 1996. These letters conflict with the labor certification which states the beneficiary worked for [REDACTED] Contractors beginning in August 1995. Further, it is unclear whether [REDACTED] is the same company as [REDACTED], preventing the AAO from determining if the letter meets the regulatory requirements. *Id.* Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's evidence may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition.

Matter of Ho, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988). It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Id.*

Additionally, even if the AAO were to consider these experience letters to be credible, it is unclear that the position of sewing machine operator, as stated in these experience letters, is the same as the position offered, tailor, as the December 3, 1996 letter states that the beneficiary's only job duties were to "join parts of garments together using a single/double needle sewing machine." The job duties listed on the labor certification are as follows:

Makes garments according to customer specifications and measurements by developing designs for garments or copying existing designs. Cutting and positioning fabric according to pattern sections. Assembling garments by hand or operating sewing including overlock machines, utilizing appropriate stitching methods in garment. Drafting pattern according to measurements and specified style.

Thus, it is not clear that the beneficiary's employment as a sewing machine operator qualified as 24 months of experience in the job offered. The duties for the sewing machine operator do not appear to be as complex or require the same skills or level of experience as the position offered. It is also unclear whether the beneficiary's employment for [REDACTED] was full-time employment. The record contains the beneficiary's W-2 Form from [REDACTED] for 1999 which states wages of \$8,185.00 and a W-2 Form from [REDACTED] from 1999 which states wages of \$3,794.17, both of which appear to be part-time employment. Therefore, the record does not contain any credible evidence to document that the beneficiary possessed the required 24 months of experience in the position offered as of 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).

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.