U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

B6

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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

[redacted]

File: [redacted] Office: Nebraska Service Center Date: JAN 11 2002

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

PUBLIC COPY

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

Helen E. Crawford for

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a substance abuse counseling clinic. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a substance abuse counselor. 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 additional evidence.

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 9, 1998. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is $18.55 per hour or $38,584 annually.

The petitioner initially submitted copies of the petitioner's 1998 and 1999 Form 1120-A U.S. Corporation Short-Form Income Tax Return. The 1998 federal tax return reflected gross receipts of $156,134; gross profit of $156,084; compensation of officers of $0; salaries and wages paid of $110,920; depreciation of $2,112; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of -$2,799. Part III reflected total current assets of $3,121 in cash and total current liabilities of $3,289. The 1999 federal tax return reflected gross receipts of $157,365; gross profit of $156,325; compensation of offices of $64,490; salaries and wages paid of $50,736; depreciation of $1,267; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of -$722. Part III reflected total current assets of $3,603 in cash and total current liabilities of $4,504.

On January 2, 2001, the director requested additional evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of January 9, 1998.

In response, the petitioner submitted a profit and loss statement for the period from January, 2000 to December 2000.

The director determined that the additional evidence did not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel argues that the money spent on temporary workers could be used to pay the beneficiary's salary.

Counsel's assertion that the funds paid to temporary workers could be used to pay the beneficiary's salary is not persuasive. These funds were not retained by the petitioner for future use. Instead, these monies were expended on compensating the temporary workers, and therefore, not readily available for payment of the beneficiary's salary in 1998. Based on the evidence submitted, it cannot be found that the petitioner had sufficient funds available to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage at the time of filing the application for alien employment certification as required by 8 C.F.R. 204.5(g)(2).

A review of the 1998 federal tax return shows that when one adds the taxable income and the depreciation, the result is -$687, less than the proffered wage.

A review of the 1999 federal tax return shows that when one adds the taxable income and the depreciation, the result is $545, less than the proffered wage.

Accordingly, after a review of the federal tax returns, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had sufficient available funds to pay the salary offered at the time of filing of the petition.

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.