




B6

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

identity tag data deleted to
prevent identity theft
invasion of personal privacy

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



File: EAC 01 170 53818

Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: JUN 18 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:
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:



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

Robert P. Wiemann
Robert P. Wiemann, 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 rehabilitation center. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a physical therapist. 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 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 April 16, 2001. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$52,000.00 per annum.

Counsel initially submitted insufficient evidence of the

petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. On August 24, 2001, the director requested additional evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage.

In response, counsel submitted a letter from the petitioner. The director determined that the evidence did not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage noting that:

Because the initially submitted evidence did not establish that you can afford the beneficiary's salary, we sent you a letter asking for such evidence, in the form of tax returns, audited financial statements, or similar evidence. In response to our letter, you have submitted a November 12, 2001 letter from your organization stating that you can afford the beneficiary's salary. You do not provide any income figures for the organization to support the assertion that you can afford the beneficiary's salary.

On appeal, counsel submits a letter from the petitioner's accountant and copies of the petitioner's 1999 and 2000 Form 1120 U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The 2000 federal tax return reflected gross receipts of \$476,167; gross profit of \$476,167; compensation of officers of \$0; salaries and wages paid of \$205,732; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of -\$21,027.

On appeal, the petitioner's accountant states that "the corporation is active and constantly expanding its gross revenue. It is very difficult to find capable, trained physical therapists at this time."

The petitioner's Form 1120 for fiscal year June 1, 2000 through February 28, 2001 shows a taxable income of -\$21,027. The petitioner could not pay a proffered salary of \$52,000 per year out of a negative income. Therefore, the petitioner has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage based upon its net income.

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.