

Bb

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: EAC 02 102 53378 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: NOV 25 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



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:



identifying data deleted to
prevent disclosure of
invasion of personal privacy

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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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.

Robert P. Wiemann
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a business software solutions company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently as a programmer/analyst. 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 December 8, 2000.

The Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750) indicated that the position of programmer/analyst required a Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Science and one year of experience in the related occupation of design and development of web pages using HTML.

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 re-submits the academic evaluation from the Foundation for International Services, Inc., and argues that the beneficiary does in fact have the foreign equivalent to a United States baccalaureate degree.

The record contains the above-mentioned educational evaluation from the Foundation for International Services, Inc. which states that the beneficiary has "the equivalent of a master's degree in chemistry plus professional training in computer programming from an accredited college or university in the United States and has,

as a result of his educational background and employment experiences (3 years of experience = 1 year of university-level credit), an educational background the equivalent of an individual with a bachelor's degree in computer science from an accredited college or university in the United States."

Counsel states that the petitioner has submitted documentation to establish that the beneficiary had a combination of education and experience to meet the requirements set forth in the Form ETA 750 prior to the filing date of the petition. The three year experience for one year of education rule used in the evaluation, however, is applicable to nonimmigrant H1B petitions, not immigrant petitions. The beneficiary is required to have a bachelor's degree in Computer Science on the Form ETA 750. The petitioner's actual minimum requirements could have been clarified or changed before the ETA 750 was certified by the Department of Labor. Since that was not done, the director's decision to deny the petition must be affirmed.

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 of science degree in computer science on December 8, 2000. 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.