



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




DATE: APR 17 2013 OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other, Unskilled Worker Pursuant to § 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 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 facility for the developmentally disabled. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a maintenance repairer. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien 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 in the years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2007. 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 decision dated April 25, 2012, the primary 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)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states in pertinent part:

Ability of prospective employer to pay wage. Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The petitioner must also demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its Form ETA 750 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 April 22, 2002. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$1740.80 per month (\$20,889.60 per year). The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires three months of experience in the job offered as a maintenance person.

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 the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1986 and to currently employ 7 workers. According to its corporate tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on April 10, 2002, 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 a Form ETA 750 establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the Form 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 during any relevant timeframe including the period from the priority date or subsequently. Further, we do note that the record contains Forms W-2 for the beneficiary for tax years 2002 through 2010, for \$6,600; \$14,400; \$15,600; \$13,200; \$15,376; \$20,478; \$20,889; \$20,889; and \$20,889 respectively. The petitioner has established its ability to pay the proffered wage for 2008, 2009, and 2010 through an examination of the beneficiary's Forms W-2. However, the amounts for 2002 through 2007 are not equal to or more than the proffered wage, but we will consider these amounts in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage in conjunction with its federal income tax returns. Further, the record does contain purported checks and pay stubs issued to the beneficiary; however, this evidence carries very little evidentiary weight in establishing the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage and will not be considered. Thus the petitioner, through an examination of the submitted Forms W-2, has not established that it paid the beneficiary a wage equal to or greater than the proffered wage for 2002 through 2007.

¹ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations 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).

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 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).

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.² A corporation’s year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If the total of a corporation’s end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets.

The record before the director closed on December 8, 2011 with the receipt by the director of the petitioner’s submissions in response to the director’s request for evidence. However, the petitioner’s income tax return for 2009 is the most recent return available in the record. The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate its net income, wages paid to the beneficiary and net current assets, as shown in the table below:

Tax Year	Proffered Wage	Wage Paid	Net Income*	Total ¹	CA	CL	Total ²
2002	\$20,890	\$6,600	\$4,057	-\$10,233	\$28,570	-\$26,696	-\$12,416
2003	\$20,890	\$14,400	-\$4,854	-\$11,344	\$0	\$0	-\$6,490
2004	\$20,890	\$15,600	-\$14,694	-\$19,984	\$15,424	-\$26,986	-\$16,852
2005	\$20,890	\$13,200	\$27,025	\$19,335			
2006	\$20,890	\$15,377	-\$10,895	-\$16,408	\$50,651	-\$26,696	\$18,442
2007	\$20,890	\$20,479	-\$27,666	-\$28,077	\$24,094	-\$26,696	-\$3,013

Net Income* Ordinary income (loss) from trade or business activities (Line 21-IRS Form 1120S); OR Sch. K income (loss): 2006-2009-line 18; 2004-2005 line 17e; 2002-2003-line 23(use Sch. K if these lines differ from page 1, Line 21). Total¹ is the difference between proffered wage and net income; Total² is the difference between the proffered wage and CA plus CL (net current assets).

Based on the table above for the years 2005 and 2006, the petitioner did have sufficient net income or net current assets to pay the proffered wage. However, based on a review of the petitioner’s net income, wages paid to the beneficiary and net current assets, the petitioner has not demonstrated an ability to pay the proffered wage for 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2007.

On appeal, the petitioner asserts that the petitioner’s bank statement records and a review of the totality of the petitioner’s circumstances will establish its ability to pay the proffered wage.

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

Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax returns and payroll records 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 to include 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2007.

Counsel's reliance on the balances in the petitioner's monthly bank account statements 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. 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 that were considered above in determining the petitioner's net current assets.

Counsel relies on a decision by the seventh circuit court of appeals in *Construction and Design Co. v. USCIS*, 563 F.3d 593 (7th Cir. 2009). In that case, the seventh circuit addressed the method used by USCIS in determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The court in *Construction and Design Co.* concurred with existing USCIS procedure in determining an employer's ability to pay the proffered wage. This method involves (1) a determination of whether a petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage; (2) where the petitioner does not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage during the relevant period, an examination of the net income figure and net current assets reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax returns; and (3) an examination of the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning business pursuant to *Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612.

Further, the court in *Construction and Design Co.* noted that the "proffered wage" could understate the cost to the employer in hiring an employee, as opposed to an independent contractor, as the employer must pay the salary "plus employment taxes (plus employee benefits, if any)." *See id.* at 596. The court stated that if an employer has enough cash flow, either existing or anticipated, to be able to pay the salary of a new employee along with its other expenses, it can "afford" that salary unless there is some reason, which might or might not be revealed by its balance sheet or other accounting records, why it would be an improvident expenditure. *Id.* at 595.

In this matter, the AAO's evaluation of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage considers the totality of the circumstances (see *infra*), and thus fully complies with the decision in *Construction and Design Co.*, even if it were a precedent decision in this matter, which it is not. The AAO is bound by the Act, agency regulations, precedent decisions of the agency, and published decisions from the circuit court of appeals within the circuit where the action arose. *See N.L.R.B. v.*

Askenazy Property Management Corp. 817 F. 2d 74, 75 (9th Cir. 1987) (administrative agencies are not free to refuse to follow precedent in cases originating within the circuit). The present matter did not arise within the seventh circuit.

USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's business activities in its determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612. The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about \$100,000. During the year in which the petition was filed in that case, the petitioner changed business locations and paid rent on both the old and new locations for five months. There were large moving costs and also a period of time when the petitioner was unable to do regular business. The Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner's prospects for a resumption of successful business operations were well established. The petitioner was a fashion designer whose work had been featured in *Time* and *Look* magazines. Her clients included Miss Universe, movie actresses, and society matrons. The petitioner's clients had been included in the lists of the best-dressed California women. The petitioner lectured on fashion design at design and fashion shows throughout the United States and at colleges and universities in California. The Regional Commissioner's determination in *Sonogawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere. As in *Sonogawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of a petitioner's net income and net current assets. USCIS may consider such factors as the number of years the petitioner has been doing business, the established historical growth of the petitioner's business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry, whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service, or any other evidence that USCIS deems relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

In the instant case, it appears that the petitioner claims to employ seven workers and to have been in business since 1986. Further, we have reviewed the gross sales and reported wages on the submitted income tax forms. The evidence purports that the petitioner has not had an appreciable increase in its sales. In fact, in 2003, the petitioner reported no sales or salaries paid whatsoever. Additionally, the salaries and wages paid to its employees has been declining since 2002. Nevertheless, for those years in which the tax returns fail to establish the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, the record is silent concerning 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. Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage in 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2007.

Furthermore, according to USCIS records, the petitioner has filed two I-140 petitions on behalf of other beneficiaries. Accordingly, the petitioner must establish that it has had the continuing ability to pay the combined proffered wages to each beneficiary from the priority date of the instant petition. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977). The evidence in the record does not document the priority date, proffered wage or wages paid to each beneficiary, whether any of the other petitions have been withdrawn, revoked, or denied, or whether any of the other beneficiaries have obtained lawful permanent residence. Thus, it is also concluded that the petitioner has not

(b)(6)

Page 8

established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary and the proffered wages to the beneficiaries of its other petitions.

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).

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.