



**BQ**

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
**Immigration and Naturalization Service**

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

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

[Redacted]

File: [Redacted] Office: Nebraska Service Center Date: **SEP 24 2002**  
IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Alien of Extraordinary Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(A)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:  
[Redacted]

**PUBLIC COPY**

**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  
  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center. The Associate Commissioner, Examinations, dismissed a subsequent appeal. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner on a motion to reopen. The motion will be granted, the previous decision of the Associate Commissioner will be affirmed and the petition will be denied.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(A), as an alien of extraordinary ability. The director determined the petitioner had not established the beneficiary's sustained national or international acclaim necessary to qualify for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability. The Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on behalf of the Associate Commissioner, concurred.

Section 203(b) of the Act states, in pertinent part, that:

(1) Priority Workers. -- Visas shall first be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are aliens described in any of the following subparagraphs (A) through (C):

(A) Aliens with Extraordinary Ability. -- An alien is described in this subparagraph if

--

(i) the alien has extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in the field through extensive documentation,

(ii) the alien seeks to enter the United States to continue work in the area of extraordinary ability, and

(iii) the alien's entry to the United States will substantially benefit prospectively the United States.

As used in this section, the term 'extraordinary ability' means a level of expertise indicating that the individual is one of that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor. 8 C.F.R. 204.5(h)(2). The specific requirements for supporting documents to establish that an alien has sustained national or international acclaim and recognition in his or her field of expertise are set forth in the Service regulation at 8 C.F.R. 204.5(h)(3) as follows.

(i) Documentation of the alien's receipt of lesser nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards for excellence in the field of endeavor;

(ii) Documentation of the alien's membership in associations in the field for which classification is sought, which require outstanding achievements of their members,

as judged by recognized national or international experts in their disciplines or fields;

(iii) Published material about the alien in professional or major trade publications or other major media, relating to the alien's work in the field for which classification is sought. Such evidence shall include the title, date, and author of the material, and any necessary translation;

(iv) Evidence of the alien's participation, either individually or on a panel, as a judge of the work of others in the same or an allied field of specialization for which classification is sought;

(v) Evidence of the alien's original scientific, scholarly, artistic, athletic, or business-related contributions of major significance in the field;

(vi) Evidence of the alien's authorship of scholarly articles in the field, in professional or major trade publications or other major media;

(vii) Evidence of the display of the alien's work in the field at artistic exhibitions or showcases;

(viii) Evidence that the alien has performed in a leading or critical role for organizations or establishments that have a distinguished reputation;

(ix) Evidence that the alien has commanded a high salary or other significantly high remuneration for services, in relation to others in the field; or

(x) Evidence of commercial successes in the performing arts, as shown by box office receipts or record, cassette, compact disk, or video sales.

It should be reiterated, however, that the petitioner must show that the beneficiary has sustained national or international acclaim at the very top level.

This petition seeks to classify the beneficiary as an alien with extraordinary ability as a program manager specializing in waste treatment. The beneficiary is an engineer. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. 204.5(h)(3) indicates that an alien can establish sustained national or international acclaim through evidence of a one-time achievement (that is, a major, international recognized award). Barring the alien's receipt of such an award, the regulation outlines ten criteria, quoted above, at least three of which must be satisfied for an alien to establish the sustained acclaim necessary to qualify as an alien of extraordinary ability.

In its 14-page decision, the AAO concluded that the beneficiary's Cullinan Design award "appears to satisfy the regulatory criterion" and that the beneficiary had made a contribution of major significance to his field. With regard to the other criteria claimed by the petitioner, the AAO, in

careful detail, concluded that the published material did not appear in major media, that the petitioner had not demonstrated how the beneficiary's salary compared with others in the field, and that the associations of which the beneficiary is a member have not been shown to require outstanding achievements for members. Finally, the AAO asserted that counsel had not adequately explained why the Service should accept comparable evidence of national acclaim under 8 C.F.R. 204.5(h)(4). Specifically, the AAO concluded that a sufficient number of the criteria readily apply to the beneficiary's field of engineering. The AAO noted that if the petitioner narrowed the beneficiary's field to waste treatment, the beneficiary's award, issued prior to his involvement in this specialty, could not be considered.

On motion, counsel fails to address any of the above deficiencies noted by the AAO. Instead, the petitioner submits two letters not previously in the record.<sup>1</sup> Congressman Frank Wolf discusses the beneficiary's awards and asserts that expert witnesses confirm that the beneficiary is an international expert on waste treatment technology. As discussed above, the AAO concluded that the beneficiary did meet the awards criterion. Further, the regulations require that a beneficiary meet three objective criteria. The regulations do not permit the Service to rely solely on the subjective opinions of experts chosen by the petitioner or beneficiary.

The petitioner also submits a letter and declaration from J. Patrick Nicholson, another specialist in waste management treatment working with the petitioner's competitor. Mr. Nicholson discusses the importance of the beneficiary's work. The AAO has never questioned the importance of the beneficiary's area of work. Moreover, as stated above, the AAO has already concluded that the beneficiary has made major contributions to his field.

None of the new evidence addresses the AAO's concerns regarding the beneficiary's memberships, media attention, and remuneration. Nor have counsel, the petitioner, or the new letters addressed the AAO's reasons for not accepting comparable evidence in this case.

The documentation submitted in support of a claim of extraordinary ability must clearly demonstrate that the alien has achieved sustained national or international acclaim and is one of the small percentage who has risen to the very top of the field of endeavor.

Review of the record, however, does not establish that the beneficiary has distinguished himself as an engineer to such an extent that he may be said to have achieved sustained national or international acclaim or to be within the small percentage at the very top of his field. Therefore, the petitioner has not established the beneficiary's eligibility pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act and the petition may not be approved.

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the documents was not in the record because it was submitted to the Service after the period of time in which to supplement the appeal had elapsed and was returned. The AAO specifically noted in its decision that had that document been in the file, the AAO would not have needed to consider it since it was submitted too late.

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 sustained that burden. Accordingly, the previous decision of the Associate Commissioner will be affirmed, and the petition will be denied.

**ORDER:** The Associate Commissioner's decision of January 7, 2002 is affirmed. The petition is denied.