PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

B6

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

*ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE*
*425 Eye Street N.W.*
*BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F*
*Washington, D.C. 20536*

[redacted]

File: WAC 01 276 53569 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 05 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:
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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

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 Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) 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.

Helen E. Crawford for
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a clothes manufacturer. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently as a plant manager. 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 met the petitioner's qualifications for the position as stated in the labor certification.

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.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and who are members of the professions.

A labor certification is an integral part of this petition, but the issuance of a labor certification does not mandate the approval of the relating petition. 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 priority date. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the petition's priority date is March 18, 1996.

The Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750) indicated that the position of plant manager required a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering or related, and two years of experience in the job offered.

The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had the required Bachelor's degree and denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the beneficiary has a foreign degree equivalent to a bachelor's degree in Physics. Counsel states that the petitioner is not attempting to rely on a combination of work experience and education as the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in Physics, but rather that the beneficiary possesses a foreign degree that is the equivalent of the required degree. In support of this claim, counsel submits an educational evaluation from [redacted] of Education International which states that the beneficiary "has achieved the functional equivalent of a Bachelor's degree in Physics at a accredited institution in the United States."

As noted by the director:

> The labor certification (ETA 750) states that the minimum qualification for the position is a bachelor's degree in science or related. The labor certification does not state that any lesser level of education will satisfy this requirement. The evidence of record shows that the beneficiary has completed three years of academic study. This does not qualify as a four-year baccalaureate degree.

The issue here is whether the beneficiary met all of the requirements stated by the petitioner in block #14 of the labor certification as of the day it was filed with the Department of Labor. The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary had a bachelor's degree on March 18, 1996. Therefore, 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.