




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services


(b)(6)



DATE: JUN 24 2013

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER


FILE:



IN RE:


Petitioner:

Beneficiary:



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

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 is a construction/home renovation company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a carpenter. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification (labor 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 June 19, 2012 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)(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.

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 labor 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 labor 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 ETA Form 9089 was accepted on March 3, 2011. The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$71,386.00 per year. The ETA Form 9089 states that the position requires twenty-four months of experience in the position 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. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year runs from November 1 to October 31. On the labor certification, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1978, and to employ two workers. Form I-140 requests information on the petitioner's date of establishment, current number of employees, gross and net annual income; however, the petitioner did not include any of this required information. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on May 18, 2011, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner beginning on March 1, 2002.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of a labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the labor certification, 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 wages paid to the beneficiary during the year 2011 in the amount of \$21,025.95. The proffered wage of \$71,386 is greater than the actual wages paid to the beneficiary during 2011. Therefore, in the instant case, the petitioner has not established that it employed and paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage from the priority date. The petitioner must demonstrate its ability to pay the difference between the proffered wage and wages paid in 2011, which is \$50,360.05.

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.*

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).

Napolitano, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010), *aff'd*, No. 10-1517 (6th Cir. filed Nov. 10, 2011). Reliance on federal income tax returns as a basis for determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is well established by judicial precedent. *Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava*, 632 F. Supp. 1049, 1054 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) (citing *Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F.2d 1305 (9th Cir. 1984)); see also *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Texas 1989); *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. 1080 (S.D.N.Y. 1985); *Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7th Cir. 1983). Reliance on the petitioner's gross sales and profits and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross sales and profits exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. at 1084, the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now USCIS, had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns, rather than the petitioner's gross income. The court specifically rejected the argument that the Service should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. See *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d at 881 (gross profits overstate an employer's ability to pay because it ignores other necessary expenses).

With respect to depreciation, the court in *River Street Donuts* noted:

The AAO recognized that a depreciation deduction is a systematic allocation of the cost of a tangible long-term asset and does not represent 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 January 26, 2012, 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 Fiscal Year 2011 federal income tax return was not yet due. Therefore, the petitioner's income tax return for Fiscal Year 2010,² covering the period from November 1, 2010, to October 31, 2011, would be the most recent return sought. The petitioner's tax return demonstrates its net income for its fiscal year 2010, line 28, as \$11,501.

Therefore, for its fiscal year 2010, the petitioner did not have sufficient net income to pay the difference between the proffered wage and wages paid in 2011.

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.³ 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 tax return demonstrates its end-of-year net current assets for fiscal year 2010 as (\$52,004).

Therefore, for the fiscal year 2010, the petitioner did not have sufficient net current assets to pay the difference between the proffered wage and the wages paid in 2011.

Therefore, 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 petitioner would utilize a portion its compensation to officers to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary. The petitioner submits an itemized list of expenses for the sole owner and sole officer of the company, and indicates he has sufficient additional income to pay his personal expenses without the officer compensation which is discretionary. The petitioner indicates that he would be willing to forgo a portion of this officer compensation in order to pay the additional amount over the actual wages paid of \$21,025.95 necessary to meet the proffered wage amount of \$71,386. The petitioner alleges that the officer's personal income tax return for fiscal year 2010 shows officer compensation in the amount of \$85,000. However, no evidence of this

² The petitioner also submitted federal income tax form 1120 for the years 2008 and 2009. However, since the priority date is March 3, 2011, the 2008, and 2009 tax returns would not be used in demonstrating the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage from the priority date.

³ 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.

assertion has been provided. 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)).

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.

Further, the itemized statement submitted by the petitioner's sole owner indicating his own personal expenses and income was not submitted with any independent evidence of the figures indicated. It has therefore, not been sufficiently established that any officer compensation would be discretionary income from which the petitioner would be able to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary. 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)). Further, the AAO notes that even if the petitioner had established the officer's expenses to be accurate as provided, the evidence in the record would be insufficient to establish that the officer had income after expenses that would cover the \$50,360.05 difference between the proffered wage and wages paid; the officer indicates only \$1,078 in income per month after expenses, which annually is less than the difference noted. 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).

Thus, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary from the priority date onward.

USCIS may also 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 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 *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 petitioner has not offered sufficient evidence in line with *Sonegawa* to establish that based on a totality of circumstances it had the ability to pay the beneficiary from the priority date until lawful permanent residence. While on the labor certification the petitioner claimed to have a commercial business in 1978, the petitioner's tax returns indicate it was not incorporated until 1985. Counsel asserts the petitioner's business is growing, however, the petitioner's taxes show no wages or salaries paid, although it does report costs for labor. However, the record does not establish whether these costs represent direct employment or contract labor or subcontractor costs. The petitioner did not pay the beneficiary the full proffered wage during any relevant year. While the beneficiary has been purportedly employed by the petitioner full-time since 2002, the wages paid to the beneficiary are not significant compared to the proffered wage. The petitioner indicated that the sole owner could forgo his officer compensation to supplement the wages paid to the beneficiary, but failed to offer supporting objective evidence of this assertion. 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).

Further, the petitioner's net income and net current assets, combined were not equal or greater to the proffered wage for the relevant time period according to the evidence presented. The petitioner has also not provided any evidence of its reputation, or of any uncharacteristic losses.

Therefore, the petitioner has failed to establish that factors similar to *Sonegawa* existed in the instant case, which would permit a conclusion that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage despite its shortfalls in wages paid to the beneficiary, net income and net current assets.

Accordingly, after considering the totality of the circumstances, the petitioner has failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary since the priority date.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has also not established that the beneficiary is qualified for the offered position. The petitioner must establish that the beneficiary possessed all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the priority date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977); *see also Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg'l Comm'r 1971). In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-*

Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered position requires 24 months of experience. The petitioner submitted a letter from [REDACTED] in order to demonstrate that the beneficiary possess this experience. However, the letter indicates that the beneficiary worked an "average of 40 hours per-week." This information does not conclusively allow the AAO to determine the actual amount of experience the beneficiary received while working with this employer. As this is the only experience listed on the labor certification, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the beneficiary possessed the required experience for the job offered at the time the labor certification was filed. Moreover, the letter provided does not indicate the writer's title or the date it was prepared as required by regulation. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(1) and (l)(3)(ii)(A).

In addition, the wording of the beneficiary's experience in the letter and the experience required on the labor certification are similar, casting doubt on the claimed experience. In any further filings, evidence of the beneficiary's experience must include independent, objective evidence of that experience, such as pay records, government work records, or other government records.

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).

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.