




B7c

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



File: [Redacted] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date:


MAR 16 2001

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

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)

Public Copy

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



Identification data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which 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 which 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 which 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, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cook. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification approved by the Department of Labor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had the requisite experience as of the petition's filing date.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief and previously submitted documentation.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

The issue to be considered in this proceeding is that to be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the training, education, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's filing date. Matter of Wing's Tea House, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the petition's filing date is January 9, 1998.

The Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750) indicated that in order to perform the duties of the position, the beneficiary must possess two years of experience in the job offered, or two years of experience of work in a Chinese Restaurant/Kitchen.

The director determined that the petitioner had not shown that the beneficiary possessed the requisite experience in the job offered.

On appeal, counsel re-submits a letter from Ruby Lai, the beneficiary's supervisor, which attests to the beneficiary's employment as a kitchen helper from October of 1994 to October of 1995. Mr. [REDACTED] further states that the beneficiary was promoted to cook and was assigned to the petitioning restaurant.

The director, however, correctly noted that "[T]he evidence indicates that the beneficiary was only kitchen help from October 1994 to October 1995, and as such this experience would not qualify for the position as a specialty cook."

Mr. [REDACTED] affidavit merely states that the beneficiary was promoted to cook and relocated to the petitioner. No evidence has been submitted to testify how long the beneficiary worked as a cook for the petitioning restaurant. Therefore, the petitioner has not overcome the director's objections and the petition may not be approved.

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.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.