




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



(b)(6)



DATE: Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER FILE:


JAN 11 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 preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner claimed to be a computer consulting and software development business. It sought to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a systems analyst. 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 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 denials dated February 4, 2010 and April 14, 2010, 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)(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. 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.

As a threshold matter, the appeal must be dismissed as moot because the petitioner no longer intends to employ the beneficiary. The petitioner is no longer in business and the record is devoid of evidence establishing that a different business entity has become a successor-in-interest to the petitioner. Accordingly, it has not been established that the petition is still accompanied by an individual labor certification from the DOL which pertains to the proffered position. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(i); 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(c). The original employer identified in the Form ETA 750 and Form I-140 is [REDACTED] and was listed as being located at [REDACTED] however, as was indicated in the AAO's Notice of Derogatory Information (NODI), [REDACTED] not [REDACTED] (a computer consulting business) was officially listed as being located at that address and suite number. The petitioner failed to address this issue in response to the NODI, and there is no evidence in the record to demonstrate a successor-in-interest relationship. *Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 481 (Comm. 1986). The petitioner's representative stated in a letter dated October 10, 2012 that the beneficiary "has joined another company [REDACTED]"

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.

Although there is no evidence in the record to demonstrate that the petitioning business is still operational, the AAO will review the evidence submitted to determine whether the petitioner has demonstrated its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage. 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).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on October 29, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$40.00 per hour, based upon a forty hour work week (\$83,200.00 per year). The Form ETA 750 at part 14 states that the position requires a four-year bachelor's degree in computer science, math, physics, or equivalent and five years 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.<sup>1</sup>

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 on September 18, 1997 and that it currently employs ten plus workers. According to the 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, the beneficiary does not claim to have been employed by 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. Comm. 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

circumstances affecting the petitioning business will be considered if the evidence warrants such consideration. *See Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary during that period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner submitted copies of Forms W-2 that it issued to the beneficiary as shown in the table below:

- The petitioner did not submit a 2001 IRS Form W-2 for the beneficiary.
- The petitioner did not submit a 2002 IRS Form W-2 for the beneficiary.
- The petitioner did not submit a 2003 IRS Form W-2 for the beneficiary.
- In 2004, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$25,607.68 (a deficiency of \$57,592.32).
- In 2005, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$78,801.56 (a deficiency of \$4,398.44).
- In 2006, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$78,095.32 (a deficiency of \$5,104.68).
- In 2007, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$80,000.00 (a deficiency of \$3,200.00).
- In 2008, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$75,000.31 (a deficiency of \$8,199.69).
- In 2009, the IRS Form W-2 stated total wages of \$48,328.34 (a deficiency of \$34,871.66).

As was noted by the director, the petitioner submitted copies of pay statements and business checks that were allegedly issued to the beneficiary by the petitioner; however, the discrepancy in the numbering of the checks and other inconsistencies were not specifically addressed by the petitioner on appeal. The discrepancies surrounding the wages allegedly paid by the petitioner to the beneficiary in 2009 have not been clarified. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is incumbent on 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. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988). Absent clarification of these inconsistencies in the record, the AAO will not accept the pay statements or the Form W-2 as persuasive evidence of wages paid to the beneficiary in 2009.

If, as in this case, 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 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 2009); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010), *aff'd*, No. 10-1517

(6<sup>th</sup> 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).

The proffered wage is \$83,200.00. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states that the director may request additional evidence in appropriate cases. Although specifically and clearly

requested by the AAO in the Request for Evidence (RFE) dated September 14, 2012, the petitioner declined to provide copies of its 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 tax returns. These tax returns would have demonstrated the amount of taxable income the petitioner reported to the IRS and further reveal its ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner's failure to submit these documents cannot be excused. The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

The petitioner stated in response to the RFE that the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage should be considered until June 2004 because the provisions of the American Competitiveness in the Twenty-First Century Act of 2000 (AC21) allow for portability 180 days after filing of the beneficiary's Form I-485, which is December 2003. Contrary to the petitioner's claim, the operative language in section 204(j) and section 212(a)(5)(A)(iv) of the Act states that the petition or labor certification "shall remain valid" with respect to a new job if the individual changes jobs or employers. The term "valid" is not defined by the statute, nor does the congressional record provide any guidance as to its meaning. *See* S. Rep. 106-260; *see also* H.R. Rep. 106-1048. Critical to the pertinent provisions of AC21, the labor certification and petition must be "valid" to begin with if it is to "remain valid with respect to a new job." Section 204(j) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(j) (emphasis added).

Statutory interpretation begins with the language of the statute itself. *Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare v. Davenport*, 495 U.S. 552 (1990). We are expected to give the words used in the statute their ordinary meaning. *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984). Furthermore, we are to construe the language in question in harmony with the thrust of related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *K Mart Corp. v. Cartier Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996).

With regard to the overall design of the nation's immigration laws, section 204 of the Act provides the basic statutory framework for the granting of immigrant status. Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(F), provides that "[a]ny employer desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification under section . . . 203(b)(3) . . . of this title may file a petition with the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] for such classification." (Emphasis added.)

Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), governs USCIS's authority to approve an immigrant visa petition before immigrant status is granted:

After an investigation of the facts in each case . . . the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is . . . eligible for preference under subsection (a) or (b) of section 203, approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary

of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

Statute and regulations allow adjustment only where the alien has an approved petition for immigrant classification. Section 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a); 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2).<sup>2</sup>

Pursuant to the statutory framework for the granting of immigrant status, any United States employer desiring and intending to employ an alien “entitled” to immigrant classification under the Act “may file” a petition for classification. Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(F). However, section 204(b) of the Act mandates that USCIS approve that petition only after investigating the facts in each case, determining that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien is eligible for the requested classification. Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). Hence, Congress specifically granted USCIS the sole authority to approve an immigrant visa petition; an alien may not adjust status or be granted immigrant status by the Department of State until USCIS approves the petition.

Therefore, to be considered “valid” in harmony with the portability provisions of AC21 and with the statute as a whole, an immigrant visa petition must have been filed for an alien that is entitled to the requested classification and that petition must have been approved by USCIS pursuant to the agency’s authority under the Act. *See generally* section 204 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154. A petition is not validated merely through the act of filing the petition with USCIS or through the passage of 180 days.

The portability provisions of AC21 cannot be interpreted as allowing the adjustment of status of an alien based on an unapproved visa petition when section 245(a) of the Act explicitly requires an approved petition (or eligibility for an immediately available immigrant visa) in order to grant adjustment of status. To construe section 204(j) of the Act in that manner would violate the “elementary canon of construction that a statute should be interpreted so as not to render one part inoperative.” *Dept. of Revenue of Or. v. ACF Indus., Inc.*, 510 U.S. 332, 340 (1994).

We will not construe section 204(j) of the Act in a manner that would allow ineligible aliens to gain immigrant status simply by filing visa petitions and adjustment applications, thereby increasing USCIS backlogs, in the hopes that the application might remain unadjudicated for 180 days.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> We note that the Act contains at least one provision that does apply to pending petitions; in that instance, Congress specifically used the word “pending.” *See* section 101(a)(15)(V) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(V) (establishing a nonimmigrant visa for aliens with family-based petitions that have been pending three years or more).

<sup>3</sup> Moreover, every federal circuit court of appeals that has discussed the portability provision of section 204(j) of the Act has done so only in the context of deciding an immigration judge’s jurisdiction to determine the continuing validity of an approved visa petition when adjudicating an alien’s application for adjustment of status in removal proceedings. *Sung v. Keisler*, 2007 WL 3052778 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. Oct. 22, 2007); *Matovski v. Gonzales*, 492 F.3d 722 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. Jun. 15, 2007); *Perez-Vargales v. Gonzales*, 478 F.3d 191 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007). In *Sung*, the court quoted section 204(j) of

The enactment of the job flexibility provision at section 204(j) of the Act did not repeal or modify sections 204(b) and 245(a) of the Act, which require USCIS to approve an immigrant visa petition prior to granting adjustment of status. Therefore, the provisions of AC21 do not apply to the instant matter; and therefore, the petitioner must demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage – and the ongoing existence of the job opportunity – from the priority dated until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

The petitioner's 1120S<sup>4</sup> tax returns demonstrate its net income as shown in the table below:

- In 2001, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$252,012.00.
- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$8,753.00.
- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$43,494.00.
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$9,648.00.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net income of -\$48,027.00.
- In 2006, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$35,018.00.
- In 2007, the Form 1120S stated net income of \$86,579.00.

Therefore, for the years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the difference between the wages paid and the proffered wage. The petitioner failed to provide its tax returns for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

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.<sup>5</sup> A corporation's year-end current assets are

---

the Act and explained that the provision only addresses when “an *approved* immigration petition will remain valid for the purpose of an application of adjustment of status.” *Sung*, 2007 WL 3052778 at \*1 (emphasis added). *Accord Matovski*, 492 F.3d at 735 (discussing portability as applied to an alien who had a “previously approved I-140 Petition for Alien Worker”); *Perez-Vargas*, 478 F.3d at 193 (stating that “[s]ection 204(j) . . . provides relief to the alien who changes jobs after his visa petition has been approved”). Hence, the requisite approval of the underlying visa petition is explicit in each of these decisions.

<sup>4</sup> 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. However, where an S corporation has income, credits, deductions or other adjustments from sources other than a trade or business, they are reported on Schedule K. If the Schedule K has relevant entries for additional income, credits, deductions or other adjustments, net income is found on line 23 (1997-2003), line 17e (2004-2005), and line 18 (2006-2010) of Schedule K. See Instructions for Form 1120S, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholders' shares of the corporation's income, deductions, credits, etc.).

<sup>5</sup> According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3<sup>rd</sup> 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

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 petitioner's tax return demonstrates its net current assets as shown in the table below:

- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$48,869.00.
- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$53,143.00.
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$24,678.00.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of \$0.00.

Therefore, for the years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005, the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary through its net current assets. As noted above, the petitioner failed to provide its tax returns for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 although specifically requested by the AAO in the RFE.

Accordingly, from the date the labor certification was accepted for processing by the DOL, the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director failed to consider all of the facts and evidence in the case in order to obtain an accurate account of the petitioner's financial ability to pay the proffered wage. Counsel urges that petitioner's owner's assets and personal liabilities may be considered in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

Counsel submitted the petitioner's financial statements for 2008. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) makes clear that where a petitioner relies on financial statements to demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage, those financial statements must be audited. An audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards to obtain a reasonable assurance that the financial statements of the business are free of material misstatements. The unaudited financial statements that counsel submitted with the petition are not persuasive evidence. The accountant's report that accompanied those financial statements makes clear that they were produced pursuant to a compilation rather than an audit. As the accountant's report also makes clear, financial statements produced pursuant to a compilation are the representations of management compiled into standard form. The unsupported representations of management are not reliable evidence and are insufficient to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage.

Counsel asserts that the loan issued to the majority shareholder should be considered in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Contrary to counsel's claim, the petitioner's existent loans will be reflected in the balance sheet provided in the tax return or

---

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

audited financial statement and have been fully considered in the evaluation of the corporation's net current assets. The record also does not establish that the shareholder would or could have repaid the loan amounts to the petitioner.

Counsel cites to *Full Gospel Portland Church v. Thornburgh*, 730 F. Supp. 441 (D.D.C. 1988). However, the decision in *Full Gospel Portland Church v. Thornburgh* 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 the wages of an occupational therapist. Here, counsel's assertion is that USCIS should treat its loan to a shareholder as evidence of its ability to pay, even though a loan is considered 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 loan.

In addition, the petitioner has failed to provide documentation which demonstrates the specific loan amounts in question and/or the terms of such loans. 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)). Furthermore, the petitioner did not attempt to amend its corporate tax returns to reflect the petitioner's intent. A petition may not be approved if the beneficiary was not qualified at the priority date, but expects to become eligible at a subsequent time. *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm'r 1971). Finally, USCIS will give less weight to loans and debt as a means of paying wages since the debts will increase the petitioner's liabilities and will not improve its overall financial position.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner owns multiple businesses and can utilize funds from its other business to cover losses incurred by the petitioner; therefore, enabling the petitioner to pay the proffered wage. Although the petitioner's owner may own multiple businesses, the petitioner must demonstrate, based upon its own financial records, its ability to pay the proffered wage. 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. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Furthermore, there is nothing in the record to show that the other business entity has paid wages to the beneficiary. Regardless, 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 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." See *Sitar v. Ashcroft*, 2003 WL 22203713 (D.Mass. Sept. 18, 2003).

USCIS may not “pierce the corporate veil” and look to the assets of the corporation’s owner or of sister corporations or limited liability companies to satisfy the petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage. It is an elementary rule that a corporation or limited liability company is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders. *See Matter of M*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958), *Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980), and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980). Consequently, assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining petitioner’s ability to pay the proffered wage.

The evidence presented on appeal cannot be concluded to outweigh the evidence of record 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. 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 assessing the totality of the circumstances in this case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage. There are no facts paralleling those in *Sonogawa* that are present in the instant matter to a degree sufficient to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage. Nor has the petitioner demonstrated the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses in the relevant years. Finally, as noted above, the petitioner no longer exists, and it has not been established that it has been succeeded by another entity. The job opportunity no longer exists, as explained by the petitioner in its letter dated October 10, 2012. The record is also devoid of

financial evidence from 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Overall, given the record as a whole, the petitioner has not established that the job offer was credible.

Accordingly, 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.