

(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: JUN 24 2013

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER FILE: 

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,

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

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the preference visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a tree service company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a landscaper. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by labor certification application approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that, as the petitioner had not established that the position offered requires at least two years of training or experience, the position offered cannot be classified as a skilled worker; therefore, the beneficiary may not be found qualified as a skilled worker based on the underlying labor certification. The director also found that the petitioner did not demonstrate an ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date until the beneficiary received lawful permanent residence. 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 May 1, 2009 denial, the issues in this case are whether or not the petitioner has established that the position offered requires at least two years of training or experience such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker, and whether or not the petitioner has established its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date until the beneficiary receives 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. By comparison, section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of 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.

Here, the Form I-140 was filed on February 6, 2008. On Part 2.e. of the Form I-140, the petitioner indicated that it was filing the petition for a professional or a skilled worker.

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 appeal, counsel² submits the same experience letter for the

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

beneficiary submitted with the petition, from [REDACTED]. On appeal, counsel and the petitioner do not specifically address the issue of skilled worker versus unskilled worker classification on Form I-140, although it was indicated to be at issue in the director's decision.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l) provides in pertinent part:

(4) Differentiating between skilled and other workers. The determination of whether a worker is a skilled or other worker will be based on the requirements of training and/or experience placed on the job by the prospective employer, as certified by the Department of Labor.

In this case, the labor certification indicates that there is a six-month experience requirement for the proffered position, and no education or training requirements. However, the petitioner requested the skilled worker classification on the Form I-140. There is no provision in statute or regulation that compels United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to readjudicate a petition under a different visa classification in response to a petitioner's request to change it, once the decision has been rendered. A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm'r 1988).

The evidence submitted does not establish that the petition requires at least two years of training or experience such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker. The labor certification clearly indicates that six-months of experience is required for the offered job opportunity. Upon reviewing the labor certification, it is clear that corrections were made to the Form ETA 750, and approved by DOL, including changes to the experience requirements section on question 14. Therefore, according to the evidence in the record the labor certification at the time of approval by DOL, did in fact require less than two years of experience and would not qualify under the skilled worker classification in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l).

In addition, the director found that the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage. 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.

newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

² New York and New Jersey State bar records show that counsel is not an active member of either state's bar.

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 April 28, 2001. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is \$496.40 per week (\$25,812.80 annually).

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner is structured as an S corporation. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in May 13, 1986 and to currently employ seven 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 on February 7, 2001, 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 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. The petitioner submitted Form W-2 for beneficiary for the following years:

- 2002-\$10,903.00
- 2003-\$17,260.00
- 2004-\$17,120.00
- 2005-\$17,300.00
- 2006-\$31,907.00
- 2007-\$24,457.50
- 2008-\$22,952.00

However, the Form W-2s and personal income tax forms which have been submitted on behalf of the beneficiary from 2002-2008, contain varying social security number information. Public records indicate that at least one of the social security numbers utilized by the beneficiary is registered to another individual. Therefore, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proffered wage was paid at any time to the beneficiary. This casts doubt on the wage records in the record of proceedings.

Matter of Ho, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988), states:

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.

In any future filings, the petitioner must provide independent, objective evidence, and an explanation documenting that these Forms W-2 reflect payment to the beneficiary. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). If the petitioner is able to establish that it did in fact pay these sums to the beneficiary, it would establish its ability to pay in 2006 only.

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 specific cash expenditure during the year claimed. Furthermore, the AAO indicated that the allocation of the depreciation of a long-term asset could be spread out over the years or concentrated into a few depending on the petitioner's choice of accounting and depreciation methods. Nonetheless, the AAO explained that depreciation represents an actual cost of doing business, which could represent either the diminution in value of buildings and equipment or the accumulation of funds necessary to replace perishable equipment and buildings. Accordingly, the AAO stressed that even though amounts deducted for depreciation do not represent current use of cash; neither does it represent amounts available to pay wages.

We find that the AAO has a rational explanation for its policy of not adding depreciation back to net income. Namely, that the amount spent on a long term tangible asset is a "real" expense.

River Street Donuts at 118. “[USCIS] and judicial precedent support the use of tax returns and the net income figures in determining petitioner’s ability to pay. Plaintiffs’ argument that these figures should be revised by the court by adding back depreciation is without support.” *Chi-Feng Chang* at 537 (emphasis added).

The record before the director closed on May 1, 2009 with the director decision denying the petition. 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 is the most recent return available. The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate its net income for 2001 through 2008, as shown in the table below.

- In 2001, the Form 1120S stated net income³ \$4,946.00.
- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated net income -\$6,742.00.
- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net income \$16,500.00.

³ 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) line 18 (2006-2011) of Schedule K. See Instructions for Form 1120S, at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1120s.pdf> (accessed June 13, 2013) (indicating that Schedule K is a summary schedule of all shareholders’ shares of the corporation’s income, deductions, credits, etc.). In the instant case, years 2001 through 2003 net income was from Schedule K, line 23. In the years 2004 and 2005, net income was taken from Schedule K, line 17e. In the years 2006 through 2008 the net income was taken from Schedule K, line 18.

- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net income \$3,908.00.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net income \$100,223.00.
- In 2006, the Form 1120S stated net income \$11,453.00.
- In 2007, the Form 1120S stated net income -\$61,773.00.
- In 2008, the Form 1120S stated net income -\$35,188.00.

Therefore, for the years 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007, and 2008 the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage. If the petitioner is able to establish that it paid the beneficiary the Form W-2 wages indicated above, it would have established its ability to pay the proffered wage in 2003, 2005, and 2006, but not in 2001, 2002, 2007, or 2008.

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.⁴ 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 petitioner's tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets for 2001 through 2008, as shown in the table below.

- In 2001, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -\$106,677.00.
- In 2002, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -\$114,181.00.
- In 2003, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -\$215,586.00.
- In 2004, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -\$225,551.00.
- In 2005, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -\$150,343.00.
- In 2006, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -\$191,721.00.
- In 2007, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -\$86,893.00.
- In 2008, the Form 1120S stated net current assets of -\$157,930.00.

Therefore, for the years 2001 through 2008, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the proffered wage. The AAO notes that the petitioner had sufficient net income in 2005 to pay the proffered wage.

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, or its net income or net current assets.

⁴According 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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner had sufficient cash in its bank accounts to pay the proffered wage, and indicates the Yates Memo⁵ states that evidence must clearly establish petitioner's financial ability, where statements clearly show a balance under bank account of the petitioner. The Yates' Memorandum relied upon by counsel provides guidance to adjudicators to review a record of proceeding and make a positive determination of a petitioning entity's ability to pay if, in the context of the beneficiary's employment, "[t]he record contains credible verifiable evidence that the petitioner is not only is *employing the beneficiary but also has paid or currently is paying the proffered wage.*"

The AAO consistently adjudicates appeals in accordance with the Yates Memorandum. However, counsel's interpretation of the language in that memorandum is overly broad and does not comport with the plain language of the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) set forth in the memorandum as authority for the policy guidance therein. The regulation requires that a petitioning entity demonstrate its *continuing* ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which in this case is April 28, 2001.

Counsel's reliance on the balances in the petitioner's bank accounts 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 was considered above in determining the petitioner's net current assets.

Counsel also mentions the case *Sonegawa*⁶ in her brief, indicating that the petitioner in this case has maintained a viable business since May 13, 1986, similar to the petitioner in *Sonegawa*, and would therefore be able to meet the conditions of the job offer. 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. The petitioning entity in *Sonegawa* 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

⁵ See Interoffice Memo. from William R. Yates, Associate Director of Operations, USCIS, to Service Center Directors and other USCIS officials, *Determination of Ability to Pay under 8 CFR 204.5(g)(2)*, at 2, (May 4, 2004)

⁶ See *Matter of Sonegawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg'l Comm'r 1967).

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 *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 record contains no newspaper or magazine articles, awards or certifications indicating the company's milestones, and unlike *Sonegawa*, the petitioner in this case has not shown any evidence reflecting the company's reputation or historical growth since its inception. Nor has the petitioner presented evidence of any uncharacteristic business expenses or losses contributing to its inability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner has not demonstrated the financial ability and growth necessary to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary during the relevant time-frame of the instant petition. 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 petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.