


(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: **FEB 21 2013**

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER


FILE: 

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

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 an engineering firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a computer systems administrator. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, 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 August 3, 2011 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)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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.

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

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

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the ETA Form 9089 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 November 16, 2009. The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$60,154.00 per year. The ETA Form 9089 states that the position requires a Bachelor's degree in Computer Engineering and 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 a C corporation (personal service corporation). On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1978 and to currently employ six workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on the calendar year. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on October 15, 2010, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner from September 23, 2008 to November 16, 2009 (the date of filing the labor certification).

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).

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 record contains the beneficiary's 2009 and 2010 W-2 Forms issued by the petitioner demonstrating that it paid the beneficiary \$47,840.00 in both 2009 and 2010, which is a difference of \$12,314.00 between the proffered wage and the wages paid to the beneficiary for each year. Thus, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date onward.

If the petitioner does not establish that it employed and paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage during that period, USCIS will next examine the net income figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. See *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,

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).

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 March 2, 2011 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 2010 federal income tax return was not yet due.

Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for 2009 is the most recent return available. The petitioner's 2009 tax return stated net income of (\$14,699.00).² Therefore, for 2009, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the difference between the proffered wage and the wages paid to the beneficiary.

According to USCIS records, the petitioner has filed an I-140 petition on behalf of at least two other beneficiaries with priority dates earlier than 2009 and who have not adjusted to lawful permanent resident status.³ 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). As shown above, for 2009, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the difference between the proffered wage and wages paid to the instant beneficiary. Therefore, these figures cannot demonstrate that the petitioner's net income was not sufficient to pay the other beneficiaries' proffered wages from 2009 onward, in addition to the beneficiary's 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 2009 tax return stated end-of-year net current assets of (\$301.00). Therefore, for

² The record contains the petitioner's 2008 tax return, but this is for the time period before the priority date and will be considered generally in the petitioner's totality of the circumstances.

³ USCIS records demonstrate that the I-140 petition for one of these beneficiaries was approved in November 2009, and that this beneficiary has not yet adjusted to permanent resident status. The I-140 petition for the other beneficiary was denied in April 2008 and the petitioner subsequently appealed this to the AAO, which appeal was dismissed in January 2011. The petitioner must demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence, or until the petition is no longer pending. Thus, the petitioner must establish that it had the ability to pay this beneficiary's proffered wage from November 16, 2009 until this appeal was dismissed in addition to the proffered wages of the beneficiary whose petition was approved and that of the instant beneficiary. The record does not contain any evidence related to the two other beneficiaries' proffered wages, priority dates, and any wages paid. The petitioner should provide evidence of this in any further filings to demonstrate that it has the ability to pay all of its sponsored workers.

⁴ According 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.

2009, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the difference between the proffered wage and the wages paid to the beneficiary. This also demonstrates the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage in addition to the other beneficiaries' proffered wages, as noted above.

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 difference between the proffered wage and the wages paid to the beneficiary as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets.

The petitioner has identified itself on IRS Form 1120 as a "personal service corporation." Counsel asserts that the petitioner has sufficient financial flexibility as a personal service corporation to demonstrate its ability to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage. Pursuant to *Sonegawa*, the petitioner's "personal service corporation" status is a relevant factor to be considered in determining its ability to pay. A "personal service corporation" is a corporation where the "employee-owners" are engaged in the performance of personal services. The Internal Revenue Code (IRC) defines "personal services" as services performed in the fields of health, law, engineering, architecture, accounting, actuarial science, performing arts, and consulting. 26 U.S.C. § 448(d)(2). As a corporation, the personal service corporation files an IRS Form 1120 and pays tax on its profits as a corporate entity. However, under the IRC, a qualified personal service corporation is not allowed to use the graduated tax rates for other C-corporations. Instead, the flat tax rate is the highest marginal rate, which is currently 35 percent. 26 U.S.C. § 11(b)(2). Because of the high 35% flat tax on the corporation's taxable income, personal service corporations generally try to distribute all profits in the form of wages to the employee-shareholders. In turn, the employee-shareholders pay personal taxes on their wages and thereby avoid double taxation. This in effect can reduce the negative impact of the flat 35% tax rate. Upon consideration, because the tax code holds personal service corporations to the highest corporate tax rate to encourage the distribution of corporate income to the employee-owners and because the owners have the flexibility to adjust their income on an annual basis, the AAO will recognize the petitioner's personal service corporation status as a relevant factor to be considered in determining its ability to pay.

As in the present case, substantially all of the stock of a personal service corporation is held by its employees, retired employees, or their estates. The documentation presented here indicates that one sole shareholder holds 100 percent of the company's stock. However, according to the petitioner's 2009 IRS Form 1120 Schedule E (Compensation of Officers), the sole shareholder elected to pay himself \$9,100.00 in 2009. Therefore, even if the AAO were to consider all the officer compensation, it is insufficient to demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the difference between the proffered wage and the wages paid to the beneficiary. As noted above, the petitioner also filed for two additional workers and the petitioner must demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wages of all its sponsored workers. In addition, the sole shareholder's IRS Form 1040 only lists wages in the amount of \$8,100.00. 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 should resolve this discrepancy in any further filings.

In a sworn declaration, dated September 1, 2011, the petitioner's sole shareholder states that he would "inject capital" into the petitioner as needed "to fulfill the financial obligations of [the petitioner]." The information provided on appeal does not demonstrate that the petitioner had the ability to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage in addition to the other beneficiaries' proffered wages. The evidence provided indicates the sole shareholder had only received \$9,100.00 or less in officer compensation. Because a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders, the assets of its shareholders or of other people 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." A petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing; a petition cannot be approved at a future date after the petitioner becomes eligible under a new set of facts. See *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm'r 1971). In the present case, the AAO has considered the petitioner's assertions regarding the financial flexibility that the employee-owner has in setting his salary based on the profitability of the personal service corporation. However, even considering the total amount of officer compensation, the petitioner would still not be able to demonstrate its ability to pay this beneficiary, without consideration of the petitioner's other two sponsored workers.

On appeal, counsel asserts that in 2009 the petitioner purchased equipment in the amount of \$10,377.00. This equipment purchase is listed on the IRS Form 4562 as a special depreciation allowance for qualified property placed in service during the tax year. There is no evidence in the record that substantiates the type of equipment and whether this was a discretionary expense, that the business could have foregone the equipment, or that states whether the expense was an unexpected occurrence as was the case in *Matter of Sonegawa*. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Additionally, the petitioner received a depreciation deduction for the equipment, reducing the petitioner's taxable income. See *River Street Donuts, LLC v. Napolitano*, 558 F.3d 111 (1st Cir. 2009) (affirming the AAO's policy of not adding depreciation back to a petitioner's net income).⁵

⁵ As noted above, 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

Counsel also asserts that the \$8,349.00 the petitioner loaned to the sole shareholder in 2009 constituted funds that were available to pay the difference between the proffered wage and the wages paid to the beneficiary. The amount of this loan is listed on Schedule L, Line 7, of the 2009 Form 1120. As noted above, this is not considered to be part of the petitioner's "current assets" as part of the net current asset calculation. Instead, these assets would be attributed to the sole shareholder. 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." Counsel's assertions on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence presented in the tax returns as submitted by the petitioner which demonstrate that the petitioner could not pay the proffered wage from the priority date onward. As stated above, the petitioner would need to establish its ability to pay the instant beneficiary's proffered wage as well as the proffered wages for the two other beneficiaries.

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

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).

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 Form I-140 states that the petitioner has been in business since 1978 and that it currently employs six workers. The petitioner has not provided any evidence of its reputation in the industry or of its historical growth. The record contains only two tax returns. The petitioner's 2009 tax return reflects a decline in total gross receipts and in officer compensation paid. The petitioner has sponsored two additional workers and must establish that it can pay all of its sponsored workers. 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.