




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




DATE: OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE:

APR 10 2013




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 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 Director, Nebraska 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 aviation robotics manufacturer. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a geographer. 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 concluded that the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage from the priority date onwards.

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 June 22, 2012, the AAO sent the petitioner a Notice of Intent to Dismiss and Derogatory Information (NOID/NDI). The AAO notified the petitioner that, according to the website for the Washington Secretary of State's Corporations Divisions, the petitioner's company was dissolved on January 2, 2009. The AAO provided the petitioner with copies of applicable status reports.

The AAO notified the petitioner that, if its organization is no longer in business, then no *bona fide* job offer exists, and the petition and appeal are therefore moot. Even if the appeal could be otherwise sustained, the approval of the petition would be subject to automatic revocation due to the termination of your organization's business. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 205.1(a)(iii)(D). Further, the AAO stated that, if the petitioner intended to continue its appeal, it must demonstrate the continued existence, operation, and *good standing* of its organization [emphasis added].

On July 20, 2012, counsel informed the AAO that the petitioner decided in 2009 not to pay the Washington Secretary of State for the re-registration of its business. Counsel advised that the Washington Secretary of State accordingly listed the petitioner's business as being dissolved. Counsel and the petitioner's president, [REDACTED] asserted that the petitioner's business decided not to pay the Washington Secretary of State for registration, but that the business continues to

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).

operate and could be reinstated in the future. Counsel and [REDACTED] conceded that the petitioner's business has never been a financially successful business venture. Counsel additionally acknowledged that the petitioner's business is currently dormant in its existence. The petitioner has not demonstrated that the corporation is in good standing.

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)(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. Section 101(a)(32) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(32), provides that "the term 'profession' shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries."

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). 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 November 12, 2004. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$17.50 per hour (\$36,400.00 per year based on 40 hours per week). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires a Bachelor of Arts degree in Geography and two years of experience in the job offered of geographer or two years of experience in the related occupation of social science.

On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1998, to have a gross annual income of \$1,000,000.00, and currently to employ 15 workers.

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 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. In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date of November 12, 2004 or subsequently.

The petitioner submitted copies of the beneficiary's Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Forms W-2 issued by [REDACTED] for 2004 through 2008 and pay statements issued by [REDACTED] for January through March of 2009. The AAO notes that the Forms W-2 submitted list a different Employer Identification Number (EIN) [REDACTED] than that which is listed on the Form I-140 [REDACTED] for the petitioner's business. Because a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders, the assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm'r 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." Accordingly, the AAO will not consider these Forms W-2 or pay statements issued by [REDACTED] as evidence of wages paid to the beneficiary by the petitioner, [REDACTED].

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).

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.² A corporation's year-end

²According 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

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 record before the director closed on April 15, 2009 with the receipt by the director of the petitioner's submissions in response to the director's Request for Evidence (RFE). As of that date, the petitioner's 2009 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2008 should be the most recent return available.

The petitioner submitted a copy of [REDACTED] IRS Form 1120 for 2007. As noted above, because a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders, the assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. See *Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530. In a similar case, the court in *Sitar v. Ashcroft*, 2003 WL 22203713 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." This was also noted by the director in his May 4, 2009 decision. Accordingly, the AAO will not consider the net income listed on this tax return as evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered salary. The petitioner did not submit copies of its own tax returns for any of the relevant years from the priority date in 2004 or subsequently.

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, its net income, or its net current assets.

The petitioner did not submit any regulatory-prescribed evidence regarding its ability to pay, such as copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements. USCIS may, in its discretion, consider other ability to pay evidence, such 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. However, no such evidence was submitted.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner's business and [REDACTED] are sister companies housed in the same location. Counsel states that the only asset that the petitioner's business possesses is a patent for a robot, which is capable of traction along the fuselage of planes. The petitioner submitted a copy of said patent. Counsel claims that, since the petitioner's inception, [REDACTED] paid all of the petitioner's expenses. Counsel notes that [REDACTED]

one year, such accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

president of the petitioner's business and co-owner of [REDACTED] has submitted signed declarations, stating that [REDACTED] has a continuing commitment to pay all of the operating expenses of the petitioner's business. Counsel concedes that the petitioner's business has not had any resources in any year since 1998 and has not possessed sufficient income or assets to pay its operating costs, but that [REDACTED] has consistently met those costs, including paying the beneficiary's salary since the priority date.

In the June 2, 2009 signed declaration of [REDACTED] he states that there is an agreement between the shareholders and president of [REDACTED] that they will continue to loan the petitioner whatever funds are necessary to continue the petitioner's operations and that the petitioner accepts full liability for this continuing debt obligation to [REDACTED]. No evidence of any agreement between the petitioner and any other organization was submitted. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg'l Comm'r 1972)).

In the June 3, 2009 signed declaration of [REDACTED] states that he believes that, once the airline industry recovers, the petitioner's business will be profitable. Against the projection of future earnings, *Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977), states:

I do not feel, nor do I believe the Congress intended, that the petitioner, who admittedly could not pay the offered wage at the time the petition was filed, should subsequently become eligible to have the petition approved under a new set of facts hinged upon probability and projections, even beyond the information presented on appeal.

Counsel cites *Full Gospel Portland Church v. Thornburgh*, 730 F. Supp. 441 (D.D.C. 1988), which is not binding here. Although the AAO may consider the reasoning of the decision, the AAO is not bound to follow the published decision of a United States district court in cases arising within the same district. See *Matter of K-S-*, 20 I&N Dec. 715 (BIA 1993). Further, the decision in *Full Gospel* is distinguishable from the instant case. The court in *Full Gospel* ruled that USCIS should consider the pledges of parishioners in determining a church's ability to pay. Here, counsel's assertion is that USCIS should treat the commitment to pay the beneficiary's wage by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay, similar to a line of credit, which creates an expense and a debt; whereas a parishioner's pledge is a promise to give money to a church. In the latter situation, a pledge does not create a corresponding debt and liability, as does the line of credit.

Counsel refers to a decision issued by the AAO concerning totality of the circumstances, but does not provide its published citation. While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions of USCIS are binding on all its employees in the administration of the Act, unpublished decisions are not similarly binding. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a).

In the June 3, 2009 declaration of [REDACTED] and in the July 18, 2012 declaration of [REDACTED] he states that the petitioner's business suffered economically due to the events of September 11, 2001. The record of proceeding contains no evidence specifically connecting the petitioner's business decline to the events of September 11, 2001. A mere broad statement by the petitioner's president that, because of the nature of the petitioner's airplane industry, its business was impacted adversely by the events of September 11, 2001, cannot by itself, demonstrate the petitioner's continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date. Rather, such a general statement merely suggests, without supporting evidence, that the petitioner's financial status might have appeared stronger had it not been for the events of September 11, 2001. Further, the labor certification was filed in 2004, more than three years after the events of September 11, 2001. The petitioner must demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date.

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 \$100,000.00. 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 failed to provide any regulatory-prescribed evidence of its ability to pay the proffered wage from 2004 or subsequently. The petitioner failed to demonstrate that, during the relevant time period, it possessed high gross receipts, it paid officer compensation, or it paid high total wages to its employees, which could have instead been used to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage. The petitioner additionally failed to show that factors similar to those in *Sonogawa*

(b)(6)

Page 9

applied in this instance, such as factors regarding the longevity of its business operations or its 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.

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 as moot.