



B5

U.S. Department of Justice  
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identification 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:

25 MAR 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

[Redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(2)

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, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The decision of the director will be withdrawn and the petition will be remanded for further action and consideration.

The petitioner seeks classification pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(2), as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. At the time she filed the petition, the petitioner was a master's student and graduate research assistant at Kent State University ("KSU"). The petitioner asserts that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer, and thus of a labor certification, is in the national interest of the United States. The director found that the petitioner had not established that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer would be in the national interest of the United States.

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

(2) Aliens Who Are Members of the Professions Holding Advanced Degrees or Aliens of Exceptional Ability. --

(A) In General. -- Visas shall be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

(B) Waiver of Job Offer. -- The Attorney General may, when he deems it to be in the national interest, waive the requirement of subparagraph (A) that an alien's services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business be sought by an employer in the United States.

The director's decision contains no conclusion as to whether the petitioner qualifies as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. The petitioner holds a master's degree in Chemistry from Beijing Normal University, but at the time she filed the petition, she was studying for another master's degree, also in Chemistry, at KSU. The record contains no documentation to show that the first master's degree is recognized as the equivalent of a U.S. master's degree. If this earlier degree is the recognized equivalent of a U.S. master's degree, the question arises as to why it was necessary for the petitioner to study for another master's degree in the same discipline after arriving in the United States. Because the petitioner had not yet received her U.S. master's degree at the time of filing, that degree cannot satisfy the advanced degree requirement. See Matter of Katigbak, 14 I&N Dec. 45 (Reg. Comm. 1971), in which the Service held that beneficiaries seeking employment-based immigrant classification must possess the necessary qualifications as of the filing date of the visa petition.

For the foregoing reasons, the director must address the issue of the petitioner's eligibility for the underlying immigrant visa classification. The remaining issue is whether the petitioner has established that a waiver of the job offer requirement, and thus a labor certification, is in the national interest.

Neither the statute nor Service regulations define the term "national interest." Additionally, Congress did not provide a specific definition of "in the national interest." The Committee on the Judiciary merely noted in its report to the Senate that the committee had "focused on national interest by increasing the number and proportion of visas for immigrants who would benefit the United States economically and otherwise. . . ." S. Rep. No. 55, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 11 (1989).

Supplementary information to Service regulations implementing the Immigration Act of 1990 (IMMACT), published at 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60900 (November 29, 1991), states:

The Service believes it appropriate to leave the application of this test as flexible as possible, although clearly an alien seeking to meet the [national interest] standard must make a showing significantly above that necessary to prove the "prospective national benefit" [required of aliens seeking to qualify as "exceptional."] The burden will rest with the alien to establish that exemption from, or waiver of, the job offer will be in the national interest. Each case is to be judged on its own merits.

Matter of New York State Dept. of Transportation, I.D. 3363 (Acting Assoc. Comm. for Programs, August 7, 1998), has set forth several factors which must be considered when evaluating a request for a national interest waiver. First, it must be shown that the alien seeks employment in an area of substantial intrinsic merit. Next, it must be shown that the proposed benefit will be national in scope. Finally, the petitioner seeking the waiver must establish that the alien will serve the national interest to a substantially greater degree than would an available U.S. worker having the same minimum qualifications.

It must be noted that, while the national interest waiver hinges on prospective national benefit, it clearly must be established that the alien's past record justifies projections of future benefit to the national interest. The petitioner's subjective assurance that the alien will, in the future, serve the national interest cannot suffice to establish prospective national benefit. The inclusion of the term "prospective" is used here to require future contributions by the alien, rather than to facilitate the entry of an alien with no demonstrable prior achievements, and whose benefit to the national interest would thus be entirely speculative.

The director acknowledged the intrinsic merit of the petitioner's work (research pertaining to liquid crystals, which are used as electronic displays in a broad variety of applications). The director, however, found that the petitioner's occupation lacks national scope. The record does not support the director's finding. Witness statements and documentation in the record demonstrate persuasively that the petitioner's findings can be implemented throughout the industrial and research communities involved with liquid crystal technology, and her findings are nationally

disseminated by way of scholarly journals. Therefore, we hereby withdraw the director's conclusion that the petitioner's occupation has only a local impact.

With regard to the remaining prong of the national interest test, the director quotes Service policy but does not address the petitioner's specific claims and how they compare with this policy. The director states: "The alien petitioner seeks Service approval based on the lack of, or nonavailability of, a skilled graduate research assistant providing the similar benefit. Therefore, the alien's services are intended to ameliorate a local labor shortage." The record offers no evident support for this interpretation of the petitioner's claim. The director's reading of the record, therefore, appears to be inaccurate and incomplete.

There are some shortcomings in the record, such as the absence of independent testimony to establish the importance of the petitioner's work (all of the witnesses of record appear to have direct ties to the petitioner). Nevertheless, the director did not address these shortcomings or give the petitioner a reasonable opportunity to rebut or overcome them.

Therefore, this matter will be remanded. The director may request any additional evidence deemed warranted and should allow the petitioner to submit additional evidence in support of its position within a reasonable period of time. As always in these proceedings, the burden of proof rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361.

**ORDER:** The director's decision is withdrawn. The petition is remanded to the director for further action in accordance with the foregoing and entry of a new decision which, if adverse to the petitioner, is to be certified to the Associate Commissioner for Examinations for review.