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]

2 8 JUN 2002

File: EAC 01 091 50413 Office: Vermont Service Center Date:

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

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 company specializing in iron and metal works. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a supervisor, metal fabricating. 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 statement 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 August 27, 1996. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is $23.46 per hour or $48,796.80 per annum.

Counsel initially submitted copies of the petitioner's Form 1120 U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The federal tax return for the period April 1, 1997 through March 31, 1998 reflected gross receipts of $145,931; gross profit of $78,314; compensation of officers of $37,250; salaries and wages paid of $15,707; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of -$11,650. The federal tax return for the period April 1, 1998 through March 31, 1999 reflected gross receipts of 161,036; gross profit of $77,237; compensation of officers of $42,900; salaries and wages paid of $21,352; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of -$18,732.

On September 4, 2001, the director requested additional evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage.

In response, counsel submitted a copy of the beneficiary's W-2 Wage and Tax Statement which showed he was paid $16,640.00 in 1996 and a copy of the petitioner's Form 1120 U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return for the period from April 1, 1996 through March 31, 1997 which reflected gross receipts of $194,671; gross profit of $124,565; compensation of officers of $38,550; salaries and wages paid of $18,920; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of $3,025.

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

On appeal, counsel submits a letter from the petitioner's accountant which states, in pertinent part:

> In 1996 [redacted] as sole shareholder/officer received money as the net profit from the business. Had the business chosen to pay higher salaries that year [redacted] would have reduced his profit. Moreover, he could have funded the business with his own funds as he has whenever there was a need for cash. The tax return itself shows that there was an outstanding loan to [redacted] which indicates that he was quite willing and able to put his own funs (sic) into the business to help it grow.

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).

The petitioner's Form 1120 for the period from April 1, 1996 through March 31, 1997 shows a taxable income of $3,025. The petitioner could not pay a proffered wage of $48,796.80 a year out of this income. Even if the Service takes into account the salary of $16,640.00 paid to the beneficiary in 1996, the petitioner has not established the ability to pay the wage offered.

In addition, the other tax returns submitted continue to show an inability to pay the proffered wage.

Accordingly, after a review of the federal tax returns submitted, 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.