


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY




B-3

FILE: [REDACTED]
EAC 06 013 51005

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **AUG 28 2007**

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as 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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

for 
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an institute of higher learning. It seeks to classify the beneficiary 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). According to the petition, the petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary in the United States as a research associate. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had offered the beneficiary a permanent job as of the date of filing.

On appeal, the petitioner submits new letters attesting to the petitioner's intent to continue employing the beneficiary. For the reasons discussed below, we find that the record lacks a job offer predating the filing of the petition on September 29, 2005.

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.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(i)(3)(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.) Black's Law Dictionary 1111 (7th ed. 1999) defines "offer" as "the act or an instance of presenting something for acceptance" or "a display of willingness to enter into a contract on specified terms, made in a way that would lead a reasonable person to understand that an acceptance, having been sought, will result in a binding contract." Black's Law Dictionary does not define "offeror" or "offeree." The online law dictionary by American Lawyer Media (ALM), available at www.law.com, defines offer as "a specific proposal to enter into an agreement with another. An offer is essential to the formation of an enforceable contract. An offer and acceptance of the offer creates the contract." Significantly, the same dictionary defines offeree as "a person or entity to whom an offer to enter into a contract is made by another (the offeror)," and offeror as "a person or entity who makes a specific proposal to another (the offeree) to enter into a contract." (Emphasis added.)

In light of the above, we concur with the director that the ordinary meaning of an "offer" requires that it be made to the offeree, not a third party. As such, regulatory language requiring that the offer be made "to the beneficiary" would simply be redundant. Thus, a letter addressed to Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) *affirming* the beneficiary's employment is not a job *offer* within the ordinary meaning of that phrase.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(i)(2), provides, in pertinent part:

Permanent, in reference to a research position, means either tenured, tenure track, or for a term of indefinite or unlimited duration, and in which the employee will ordinarily

have an expectation of continued employment unless there is good cause for termination.

On Part 6 of the petition, the petitioner indicated that the proposed employment was a permanent position. The petitioner submitted a letter dated September 27, 2005, addressed to "Whom It May Concern," from [REDACTED], a professor at the petitioning institution. [REDACTED] confirms the beneficiary's employment as a research associate and explains that the position is "ongoing indefinitely." This document does not constitute a job offer from the petitioner to the beneficiary. On June 14, 2006, the director requested evidence that the petitioner had extended a permanent job offer to the beneficiary.

In response, the petitioner submitted a letter dated November 1, 2005 from [REDACTED] addressed to the beneficiary renewing his position as a research associate from November 1, 2005 through October 31, 2008. The letter advises that the position is not contingent on funding from a single source and states:

This reappointment will be for three years. It is my intention that you will be promoted to a higher track at the end of this period, but such action will of course be based on satisfactory performance and availability of funding.

The director concluded that the petitioner had not offered the beneficiary a permanent position. On appeal, the petitioner submitted a joint letter from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Vice-Chair of the Department of Biophysics at the petitioning institution. The letter explains that the petitioner restricts research associates to a three year appointment, after which they must be promoted to either a Research Investigator or Research Assistant Professor. [REDACTED] reiterates his "long-term commitment to employing" the beneficiary. The petitioner did not submit a job offer letter issued to the beneficiary that predates the filing of the petition on September 29, 2005.

The petitioner has not submitted the primary required initial evidence, the original job offer predating the filing date of the petition. Confirmations after the fact are not evidence of eligibility as of the date of filing. *See generally* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Regl. Commr. 1971). The petitioner has not complied with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(2) regarding the submission of secondary evidence. Specifically, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the original job offer does not exist or is unavailable. While we do not question the credibility of those who have confirmed the beneficiary's employment, counsel has not sufficiently explained why we should accept attestations about the terms and conditions in a document in lieu of the document itself. Without the initial job offer, we cannot consider the petitioner's explanations about the terms and conditions set forth in that job offer.

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.



ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.