B6

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

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

[redacted]

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

File: [redacted] Office: Vermont Service Center Date: 11 MAR 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: SELF-REPRESENTED

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, 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 specialty 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, the petitioner 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 March 19, 1997. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is $15.28 per hour or $31,782.40 per annum.

The petitioner submitted a copy of Form 1120S U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation for ARJO Corp for 1997.

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

On appeal, the petitioner submits copies of its 1999 and 2000 Form 1120S U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return and copies of various bank account statements for July 31, 1998, April 30, 1998, July 31, 1995, June 30, 1995, September 30, 1998, December 31, 1998, and November 30, 1998, and states:

> In order for my Restaurant to do well I need to hire a cook with the beneficiary's expertise, I do know that once I hire the beneficiary my business will succeed. I have enclosed my income tax for the Restaurant which show an improvement for every year, the reason why my Restaurant is not doing better is because I am the only cook and I have another business [redacted] unfortunately I do not have the time to concentrate in the Restaurant as much as I want. I have tried to hire cooks for this business but it is impossible to find Portuguese cooks.

The petitioner has submitted no evidence of the restaurant's ability to pay the proffered wage as of March 19, 1997, and since the restaurant was incorporated in 1992, the necessary tax returns should be available. The petitioner submitted evidence of its other business, the bakery, for 1997, however, a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners or stockholders. Consequently, any assets of its stockholders or of 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 1999 and 2000 federal tax returns for the restaurant continue to show that the petitioner lacked the ability to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner must show that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. 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). Therefore, the petition may not be approved.

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 and continuing to present.

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.