PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

B6

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
Washington, D.C. 20536

[redacted]

File: EAC 02 030 51159 Office: Vermont Service Center Date: JUN 18 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary: [redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON 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 Bureau of Citizenship amd Immigration Services (Bureau) 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.

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 Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a shipping agent and cargo broker. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an accountant. 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 priority 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 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 May 15, 1997. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is $63,054.16 per annum.

Counsel initially submitted a copy of the petitioner's Form 1120

U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return for fiscal year from November 1, 1996 through October 31, 1997 which reflected gross receipts of $754,898; gross profit of $754,898; compensation of officers of $89,169; salaries and wages paid of $420,887; and a taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions of $562.

On December 12, 2001, the director requested additional evidence to establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage.

In response, counsel submitted copies of the petitioner's bank statements for the period from November 1996 through October 1997, copies of the petitioner's Investment Account Summaries for the period from November 1, 1996 through October 31, 1997, and a copy of the beneficiary's W-2 Wage and Tax Statement which showed he was paid $24,750 in 1997.

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 copies of the petitioner's account receivable records for 1996 through 1999 and a letter from the petitioner. The petitioner argues that:

> I would like to say here as a business man, it is a common knowledge that the cash-in-hand should not just stay in the bank and investment accounts silently. I can have my freedom to use the cash to run my daily business operations such as purchasing, ship booking, hiring, business expansion, and other investments. Please note that the Company has consistently ended the fiscal year of 1996 to 1999 with over $2 million dollars in cash each year, which is far greater than the proffered wage and current liability.

Even though the petitioner submitted its commercial bank statements as evidence that it had sufficient cash flow to pay the wage, there is no evidence that the bank statements somehow reflect additional available funds that were not reflected on the tax return. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. See *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Counsel further states that the facts of this case are similar to several unpublished Service decisions. It should be noted that while 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that Service precedent decisions

are binding on all Service employees in the administration of the Act, unpublished decisions are not similarly binding.

The petitioner's Form 1120 for fiscal year from November 1, 1996 through October 31, 1997 shows a taxable income of $562. The petitioner could not pay a proffered wage of $63,054.16 a year out of this income.

Accordingly, after a review of the federal tax return submitted, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had sufficient available funds to pay the salary offered as of the priority date 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.