PUBLIC COPY

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

B6

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

[redacted]

File: LIN 01 206 51672 [redacted] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: JAN 22 2003

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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:
This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that 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 that 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 that 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 sustained.

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a specialty cook of Eastern European food. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification approved by the Department of Labor.

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 CFR 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 priority 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 priority date is July 3, 2000. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is $11.42 per hour or $23,753.60 per year.

The director determined that the evidence initially submitted did not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date of the petition. On August 13, 2001, the director requested signed copies of the last three (3) years U.S. income tax returns.

In response on November 19, 2001, counsel pointed out that the petitioner had provided a copy of the 2000 U.S. Form 1099 evidencing the payment of $23,760 for that year. Counsel submitted another copy of the Form 1099-MISC and requested the approval of the petition.

The director concluded that the petitioner had not established that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage at the priority date and continuing to the present since there was no evidence of income data for 2000 or any other year, bank statements, income tax returns, or current pay stubs. On January 4, 2002, the director denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel adds the petitioner's U.S. Form 1099-MISC evidencing the payment of $23,800 to the beneficiary during 2001. Counsel asserts that the actual payment of a wage equal to or more than the proffered wage supports the ability of the petitioner to pay the wage. Counsel's argument is persuasive. Service policy supports it in these circumstances.

After a review of the relevant Forms 1099-MISC, it is concluded that the petitioner has established that it had sufficient available funds to pay the salary offered as of the priority date of the petition and continuing to the 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 met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.