

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B2

PUBLIC COPY

[REDACTED]

FILE:

EAC 05 092 52269

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: OCT 12 2006

IN RE:

Petitioner:
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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks classification 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 sustained national or international acclaim necessary to qualify for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability.

On appeal, the petitioner states: "I am indeed a person of extraordinary abilities as proved by the documentation I provided."

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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). The relevant criteria will be addressed below. It should be reiterated, however, that the petitioner must show that he has earned sustained national or international acclaim at the very top level.

This petition, filed on February 7, 2005, seeks to classify the petitioner as an alien with extraordinary ability as a cantor. The statute and regulations require the petitioner's acclaim to be sustained. The record reflects that the petitioner has been residing in the United States since 1993. Given the length of time between the petitioner's arrival in the United States and the petition's filing date, it is reasonable to expect him to have earned national acclaim in the United States during that time. The petitioner has had ample time to establish a reputation as a performing vocalist in this country.

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, internationally recognized award). Barring the alien's receipt of such an award, the regulation outlines ten criteria, 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. The petitioner has submitted evidence pertaining to the following criteria.

Documentation of the alien's receipt of lesser nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards for excellence in the field of endeavor.

The petitioner submitted a certificate dated July 18, 2003 stating: "Cantors Association of Greater Britain Proudly presents to [the petitioner] the Award of Best Cantor of the Year at the 24th Annual CAB Awards." The record, however, includes no evidence showing that this award is widely recognized beyond the context of the event where it was presented. There is no evidence of national publicity surrounding this award, the criteria for granting the award, or the number of individuals eligible to compete. We note here that section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act requires extensive documentation of sustained national or international acclaim. Pursuant to the statute, the petitioner must provide adequate evidence showing that the awards presented under this criterion enjoy significant national or international stature. In this case, there is no supporting documentation from the awarding entity or print media to establish that the petitioner's award is a nationally or internationally recognized award.

On appeal, the petitioner submits an October 5, 2005 Certificate of Merit issued to him by the President of the Borough of Brooklyn, New York for his contributions to the Jewish community in Brooklyn. This award, however, reflects local recognition rather than national or international recognition. Further, this certificate was issued to the petitioner subsequent to the petition's filing date. A petitioner, however, must establish eligibility at the time of filing. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12); see *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45 (Comm. 1971). Accordingly, the AAO will not consider the Certificate of Merit in this proceeding.

In light of the above, the petitioner has not established that he meets this criterion.

Published materials 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.

In order for published material to meet this criterion, it must be primarily about the petitioner and, as stated in the regulations, be printed in professional or major trade publications or other major media. To qualify as major media, the publication should have significant national or international distribution and be published in a predominant language. An alien would not earn acclaim at the national level from a local publication or from a publication in a language that most of the population cannot comprehend. Some newspapers, such as the *New York Times*, nominally serve a particular locality but would qualify as major media because of significant national distribution, unlike small local community papers.¹

¹ Even with nationally-circulated newspapers, consideration must be given to the placement of the article. For example, an article that appears in the *Washington Post*, but in a section that is distributed only in Fairfax County, Virginia, cannot serve to spread an individual's reputation outside of that county.

In response to the director's request for evidence, the petitioner submitted an article about him appearing in *The Jewish Times* entitled "I'm the connection to God." The date of this article, however, was not identified as required by this criterion. The petitioner's response also included an article entitled "Classical: Cantors in Concert – Music of the Jewish Liturgy." Aside from the petitioner not identifying the date of this article or the title of the publication in which it appeared, we note that the article devotes less than five sentences to the petitioner. The plain wording of this criterion, however, requires "published materials about the alien." If the petitioner himself is not the primary subject of the material, then it fails to demonstrate his individual acclaim. Finally, there is no evidence showing that either of the preceding articles had substantial national readership.

The petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence also included what appears to be a paid advertisement in the May 27, 2005 issue of *The Jewish Press* for his compact disc entitled *The Classic Collection*. Promotional advertisements, which are not the result of independent journalistic reportage, cannot serve to meet this criterion. Such material is simply not indicative of national or international acclaim. On appeal, the petitioner submits an article appearing in the July 15, 2005 issue of *The Jewish Press* entitled "Theodore Bikel Featured At Holocaust Gathering Commemorating Liberation." This article, however, includes only a brief reference to the petitioner noting that he sang at the event. The preceding published materials dated May 27, 2005 and July 15, 2005 came into existence subsequent to the petition's filing date. A petitioner, however, must establish eligibility at the time of filing. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12); see *Matter of Katigbak* at 45. Accordingly, the AAO will not consider this evidence in this proceeding.

In light of the above, the petitioner has not established that he meets this criterion.

Evidence of the display of the alien's work in the field at artistic exhibitions or showcases.

The petitioner submitted event programs, photographs, and correspondence showing that he performed at various religious and community events in the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut tri-state area. This particular criterion, however, is more appropriate for visual artists (such as sculptors and painters) rather than for performing artists such as the petitioner. It is inherent to the occupation of cantor to perform before an audience. In the performing arts, acclaim is generally not established by the mere act of appearing in public, but rather by attracting a substantial audience. For this reason, the regulations establish separate criteria, especially for those whose work is in the performing arts. The petitioner's vocal performances are far more relevant to the "commercial successes in the performing arts" criterion. The petitioner has not established that he meets this criterion.

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

This criterion calls for commercial success in the form of "sales" or "receipts"; simply submitting event programs, photographs, and correspondence showing that he performed at various religious and community events cannot meet the plain wording of the regulation. The record includes no evidence of documented "sales" or "receipts" showing that the petitioner's performances drew record crowds, were regular sell-out performances, or resulted in greater audiences than other similar performances that did not feature the petitioner. In regard to the petitioner's release of a compact disc entitled *The Classic Collection*, there is no

evidence showing that his compact disc had a high national or international sales volume. The petitioner has not established that he meets this criterion.

In this case, we concur with the director's finding that the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that he meets at least three of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

The petitioner's appeal was filed on November 30, 2005. The appellate submission was accompanied by supporting evidence (which has been addressed in this decision). On the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the AAO, the petitioner indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. As of this date, more than ten months later, the AAO has received nothing further.

Review of the record does not establish that the petitioner has distinguished himself to such an extent that he may be said to have achieved sustained national or international acclaim. The evidence is not persuasive that the petitioner's achievements set him significantly above almost all others in his field at the national or international level. Therefore, the petitioner has not established eligibility pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act and the petition may not be approved.

The burden of proof in visa petition proceedings remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the petitioner has not sustained that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.