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

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

[redacted]

File: WAC 02 036 51011 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 20 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 and 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a general building contractor. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a plasterer. 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.

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 August 9, 2000. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is $9.57 per hour or $19,905.60 per annum.

Counsel submitted a copy of the petitioner's 2000 Form 1040-SS U.S.

Self Employment Tax Return including Schedule C, Profit or Loss from Business which reflected net earnings from self-employment of $19,614. Schedule C reflected gross receipts of $461,997; gross profit of $115,384; wages of $2,200; and a net profit of $21,239.

The director determined that the documentation was insufficient to establish the ability to pay the proffered wage and denied the petition accordingly. The director noted that:

> The Service has reviewed the submitted evidence and found that the petitioner has asserted that the total number of employees at the company is 10 and it appears that the company has paid the salary of these 10 employees. However, according to the documents submitted the net profit of the petitioner is $21,239 and therefore without a notable increase in profits it does not appear that the petitioner has the ability to pay the additional employees.
>
> Furthermore, Service records indicate that the petitioner, A.M.V. Construction, has recently petitioned for 5 additional aliens.

On appeal, counsel submits a copy of the petitioner's 2001 Form 1040 U.S. Individual Income Tax Return including Schedule C, Profit or Loss from Business. The 1040 shows an adjusted gross income of $22,063. Schedule C reflects gross receipts of $305,062; gross profit of $106,400; wages of $0; and a net profit of $23,741.

Counsel argues that "[t]he examiner's denial is based on negative speculation as to the future earnings and costs of petitioner. The examiner assumes costs will go up but that earnings will not."

While the petitioner has sufficient earnings to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage, the petitioner had previously filed five additional petitions. Therefore, the petitioner must show that he had sufficient income to pay all the wages at the time of filing of the petitions.

Accordingly, after a review of the evidence 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 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.