



B6

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

identification data deleted to
prevent clearly unremanded
reopening of case



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

File: WAC 00 207 53923 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: 25 MAR 2004

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: SELF-REPRESENTED

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, California Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a residential care facility. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a residence supervisor. 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, the petitioner submits a brief and additional evidence.

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, supra. Here, the petition's filing date is January 20, 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 two years of experience in the job offered, or two years of experience in the related occupation of supervisor, any industry.

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

They submitted as evidence an affidavit from the beneficiary stating that she worked as a supervisor from January 1993 to November 1998. The affidavit is self-serving, therefore it is not credible evidence that the beneficiary has the required experience.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a certificate of registration for Moneie Marketing and argues that: "[w]e are submitting the business registration of the beneficiary with this Motion, as a proof of her 2 years experience as a supervisor, for your consideration."

While the beneficiary asserts in her affidavit that she supervised employees, no evidence, such as employee payrolls, or W-2 forms has been submitted in support of this assertion.

No additional evidence of the beneficiary's experience has been submitted. Therefore, the petitioner has not overcome the director's decision.

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.