



B6

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Deleting 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



File: EAC 01 071 50909 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: JUL 22 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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



Public Copy

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
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a software consulting firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a software engineer. 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 statement and indicates that a brief will be submitted within thirty days. To date, however, no further documentation has been received. Therefore, a decision will be made based on the record as it is presently constituted.

The issue to be considered in this proceeding is whether the beneficiary has all the training, education, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's filing date. Matter of Wing's Tea House, supra. Here, the petition's filing date is April 14, 2000.

The Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750) indicated that in order to perform the duties of the position, the beneficiary must possess a bachelor's degree in computer science or Engineering and five years of experience in the job offered, or five years of experience in a related occupation.

The director determined that the petitioner had not shown that the beneficiary possessed the requisite experience in the job offered. The director noted that "[t]our attorney acknowledged that the beneficiary only possessed four years and two months of experience and requested the petition be adjudicated as a third preference skilled worker under section 203(b)(3)(i)."

On appeal, counsel merely states that "[t]he reason given for the rejection is contrary to regulations & INS practice on the subject. We will explain in detail in the brief."

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 met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.