B6

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

[redacted]

File: EAC 99 217 54270 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: MAR 12 2001

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary: [redacted]

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

Public Copy

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

Identification data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

INSTRUCTIONS:
This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cook. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification approved by the Department of Labor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the financial ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the filing date of the visa petition.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional documentation.

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 or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

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.

Eligibility in this matter hinges on the petitioner's ability to pay the wage offered as of the petition's filing date, which is the date the request for labor certification was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor. Matter of Wing's Tea House, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the petition's filing date is January 21, 1997. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is $17.43 per hour (35 hour week) or $31,722.60 per annum.

The petitioner submitted a copy of its 1997 U.S. Income Tax Return

for an S Corporation which reflected gross profit of $292,869; salaries and wages paid of $33,683; depreciation of $29,062; and an ordinary income from trade or business activities of -$37,102. The director denied the petition, noting that the petitioner had not demonstrated the ability to pay the proffered wage.

On appeal, counsel argues that officer's salaries could be used to pay the proffered wage.

Counsel's argument is not persuasive. The petitioning entity in this case is a corporation. Consequently, any assets of the individual stockholders including ownership of shares in other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. See Matter of M, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958; AG 1958); Matter of Aphrodite Investments Limited, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980); and Matter of Tessel, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980).

Although counsel states that the non-recurring start up expenses should be included as evidence of the ability to pay the proffered wage, this expenditure was already expended and those funds were not readily available to pay the wage of the beneficiary as of the filing date of the petition. Funds spent elsewhere may not be used as proof of ability to pay the proffered wage.

The compiled income statements which were submitted as proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage are in the record. They have little evidentiary value, however, as they are based solely on the representations of management. 8 C.F.R. 204.5(g)(2), already quoted above in part, states that:

> Evidence of this ability [to pay the proffered wage] shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements. . . . In appropriate cases, additional evidence . . . may be submitted by the petitioner.

This regulation neither states nor implies that an unaudited statement may be submitted in lieu of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

Upon review, the petitioner has been unable to present sufficient evidence to overcome the findings of the director in his decision to deny the petition. The petitioner has not established eligibility pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act and the petition may not be approved.

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.