



B3

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

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

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



File: [Redacted] (LIN-02-023-52991)

Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: **AUG 11 2002**

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Outstanding Professor or Researcher pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(B)

Public Copy

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: Self-represented

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, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify himself as an outstanding researcher pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(B).

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):

(B) Outstanding Professors and Researchers. -- An alien is described in this subparagraph if --

(i) the alien is recognized internationally as outstanding in a specific academic area,

(ii) the alien has at least 3 years of experience in teaching or research in the academic area, and

(iii) the alien seeks to enter the United States --

(I) for a tenured position (or tenure-track position) within a university or institution of higher education to teach in the academic area,

(II) for a comparable position with a university or institution of higher education to conduct research in the area, or

(III) for a comparable position to conduct research in the area with a department, division, or institute of a private employer, if the department, division, or institute employs at least 3 persons full-time in research activities and has achieved documented accomplishments in an academic field.

8 C.F.R. 204.5(i)(1) provides:

Any United States *employer* desiring and intending to employ a professor or researcher who is outstanding in an academic field under section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Act *may file an I-140 visa petition* for such classification.

(Emphasis added.) 8 C.F.R. 204.5(i)(iii) provides that a petition must be accompanied by:

An offer of employment from a prospective United States employer. A labor certification is not required for this classification. The offer of employment shall be in the form of a letter from:

(A) A United States university or institution of higher learning offering the alien a *tenured or tenure-track teaching position* in the alien's academic field;

(B) A United States university or institution of higher learning offering the alien a *permanent research position* in the alien's academic field; or

(C) A department, division, or institute of a private employer offering the alien a *permanent research position* in the alien's academic field. The department, division, or institute must demonstrate that it employs at least three persons full-time in research positions, and that it has achieved documented accomplishments in an academic field.

(Emphasis added.) The director denied the petition because the petition was improperly filed by the alien seeking classification as an outstanding researcher instead of an employer.

On appeal, the petitioner states that "I believe that while employed as a researcher at an institution, it is possible to petition myself with the strong backing of the employers whose letters of support were in the previous packet sent to you." The petitioner submits a job offer letter dated April 23, 2001. The letter offers the petitioner a job as a "postdoctoral scholar" at the University of Montana.

A petitioner must demonstrate eligibility at the time of filing. This letter is not evidence that the job offer was available at the time the petition was initially filed. Regardless, the letter indicates that the job offer "is for two years, but may be extended beyond for an additional year upon mutual agreement." This is not a permanent position as required by regulation.

Regardless, a job offer cannot overcome the fact that the petition was not properly filed by an employer as required. While there are self-petitioning classifications, the one sought by the petitioner is not one of them.

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 appeal will be dismissed. This denial is without prejudice to the filing of a new petition by a United States employer.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.