

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

B6

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: [Redacted]
LIN-07-157-51482

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: FEB 19 2008

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

PETITION: 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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a manufacturer and distributor of dental care products. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an operations research analyst (operational management analyst). As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the Department of Labor (DOL) accompanied the petition. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had a bachelor's degree or the equivalent as required by the Form ETA 750 as certified. Therefore, he denied the petition.

The priority date is the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The priority date for the instant petition is December 24, 2004. On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary on December 13, 2004, the beneficiary claimed to have worked for the petitioner beginning in January 2001 and continuing through the date that the Form ETA 750B was signed.

The Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, was submitted on May 9, 2007. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1998, to have a gross annual income of \$27,100,000, and to currently have 45 employees.

In a request for evidence (RFE) dated May 14, 2007 the director requested additional evidence pertaining to the beneficiary's education. In response to the RFE the petitioner submitted additional evidence which the director received on July 30, 2007.

In a decision dated August 10, 2007, the director determined that the evidence did not establish that the beneficiary had a bachelor's degree or the equivalent in the field of business administration or related as required by the Form ETA 750. Therefore, the director denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional evidence. Counsel states on appeal that evaluation reports of the beneficiary's education in the record find that, based on the beneficiary's education alone, the beneficiary has the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree in accounting. Counsel states that evidence submitted provides relevant details of the system of higher education in India in the field of accounting.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp.*, NTSB, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's *de novo* authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989).

The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

As set forth in the director's denial, the single issue in this case is whether the beneficiary has the requisite U.S. bachelor's degree in accounting or its equivalent as required by the Form ETA 750 as certified.

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, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, are professionals.

A labor certification is an integral part of this petition, but the issuance of a Form ETA 750 does not mandate the approval of the relating petition. To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's priority date. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). See also *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

The approved labor certification in the instant case requires a bachelor's degree or foreign equivalent in business administration or related field. Therefore, an operational management analyst position may be analyzed as a professional position or as skilled worker. In this case, the petitioner filed a Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, seeking classification pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Act by checking box e in Part 2 of the I-140 form. The box e is for either a professional or a skilled worker. Therefore, CIS will examine the petition under the professional and skilled worker categories.

For the professional category, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) states the following:

If the petition is for a professional, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien holds a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and by evidence that the alien is a member of the professions. Evidence of a baccalaureate degree shall be in the form of an official college or university record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study. To show that the alien is a member of the professions, the petitioner must submit evidence that the minimum of a baccalaureate degree is required for entry into the occupation.

The above regulations use a singular description of foreign equivalent degree. Thus, the plain meaning of the regulatory language concerning the professional classification sets forth the requirement that a beneficiary must produce one degree that is determined to be the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree in order to be qualified as a professional for third preference visa category purposes.

To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have the education and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's filing date, which as noted above, is January 14, 2002. See *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

The beneficiary stated his qualifications on the Form ETA 750B. In block 11, for information on the names and addresses of schools, colleges and universities attended (including trade or vocational training facilities), the beneficiary stated the following:

Schools, Colleges and Universities, etc.	Field of Study	From	To	Degrees or Certificates Received
Hansraj College, Delhi University, Delhi, India	Commerce	04/1993	03/1996	Bachelors

Institute of Chartered Accountants of India	Taxation, Auditing, Accounting	01/1995	05/1999	Chartered Accountant
National Institute of Computer Education, India	Computer	06/1996	01/1998	Certificate

The record contains a copy of a bachelor of commerce degree granted to the beneficiary on April 16, 1997 by the University of Delhi with accompanying course transcript. The transcript and the degree show that the course of studies for that degree was a three-year program. The record also contains a copy of the beneficiary's Final Examination Certificate from the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India (ICAI) issued on July 15, 1999 which indicates that the beneficiary passed that examination during May 1999 and a copy of Certificate of Membership issued to the beneficiary by the ICAI on August 31, 1999, which indicates that the beneficiary was admitted as an Associate of the ICAI on July 29, 1999. Other documents in the record, such as printout from PIER World Education Series – India, A P.I.E.R. Workshop Report on South Asia – The Admission and Placement of Students from Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, and ICAI brief.

The record contains copies of several evaluations of the beneficiary's education. An evaluation report by Educational Credential Evaluators, Inc. (ECE) finds that an ICAI Certificate of Associate Membership is based upon completion of a program of study which is the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration with a major in Accounting, and therefore, the beneficiary has the United States equivalent of a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration with a major in Accounting.

An evaluation report by e-ValReports finds that the beneficiary's Bachelor of Commerce degree is equivalent to three years of credit in business and accounting from an accredited university in the United States. The report also finds that an ICAI Certificate of Membership, and the Final Examination Certificate are equivalent to a bachelor's degree in business administration with a major in accounting from an accredited college/university in the United States.

The evaluations from Career Consulting International (CCI), European-American University and Professor [REDACTED] of the University of Bombay relies on the beneficiary's three-year bachelor of commerce degree to find that the beneficiary has the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree. This office finds that a bachelor degree is generally found to require four years of education. *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. 244, 245 (Comm. 1977). Therefore, the beneficiary's three-year degree from the University of Bombay alone cannot be considered a foreign equivalent degree. Consequently, these evaluations will not be given weight in this analysis.

CIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony such as educational credentials evaluations. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information in the record or is in any way questionable, CIS is not required to accept that evidence, or may give less weight to it. See *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm. 1988); *Matter of Sea, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 817 (Comm. 1988).

This office has also reviewed credentials evaluations information available at the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). AACRAO, according to its website, www.aacrao.org, is "a nonprofit, voluntary, professional association of more than 10,000 higher education admissions and registration professionals who represent approximately 2,500 institutions in more than 30 countries." Its mission "is to provide professional development, guidelines and voluntary standards to be used by higher education officials regarding the best practices in records management, admissions, enrollment management, administrative information technology and student services." According to the registration page for EDGE, <http://aacraoedge.aacrao.org/register/>

[index/php](#), EDGE is “a web-based resource for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials.” EDGE provides a great deal of information about the educational system in India. While it confirms that a bachelor of commerce degree is awarded upon completion of two or three years of tertiary study beyond the Higher Secondary Certificate (or equivalent) and represents attainment of a level of education comparable to two to three years of university study in the United States, it does not suggest that a three-year degree from India may be deemed a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. baccalaureate. However, EDGE confirms that ICAI associate membership upon passing the ICAI final examination represents attainment of a level of education comparable to a bachelor’s degree in the United States. The record contains documentary evidence showing the beneficiary in the instant case passed the ICAI final exam and was awarded a certificate of membership as an associate of the ICAI, which represents that the beneficiary attained an equivalent to a US bachelor’s degree in accounting. However, the professional regulation contains a degree requirement in the form of an official college or university record. ICAI is not an academic institution that can confer an actual degree with an official college or university record.

While no degree is required for the skilled worker classification, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3)(B) provides that a petition for an alien in this classification must be accompanied by evidence that the beneficiary “meets the education, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification.”

The issue before us is whether the beneficiary meets the job requirements of the proffered job as set forth on the labor certification. The regulations specifically require the submission of such evidence for this classification. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3)(B) (“the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification”). As noted above, the ETA 750 in this matter is certified by DOL.

The beneficiary possesses a foreign three-year bachelor’s degree and ICAI associate membership. Thus, the issues are whether either the degree, ICAI membership or the combination is equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate degree. We must also consider whether the beneficiary meets the job requirements of the proffered job as set forth on the labor certification.

Authority to Evaluate Whether the Alien is Eligible for the Classification Sought

As noted above, the ETA 750 in this matter is certified by DOL. Thus, at the outset, it is useful to discuss DOL’s role in this process. Section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act provides:

In general.-Any alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor is inadmissible, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General that-

(I) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified (or equally qualified in the case of an alien described in clause (ii)) and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and

(II) the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

According to 20 C.F.R. § 656.1(a), the purpose and scope of the regulations regarding labor certification are as follows:

Under § 212(a)(5)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)(A)) certain aliens may not obtain a visa for entrance into the United States in order to engage in permanent employment unless the Secretary of Labor has first certified to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General that:

- (1) There are not sufficient United States workers, who are able, willing, qualified and available at the time of application for a visa and admission into the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform the work, and
- (2) The employment of the alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of United States workers similarly employed.

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to DOL, or the remaining regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether or not the alien is qualified for a specific immigrant classification or even the job offered. This fact has not gone unnoticed by Federal Circuit Courts.

There is no doubt that the authority to make preference classification decisions rests with INS. The language of section 204 cannot be read otherwise. *See Castaneda-Gonzalez v. INS*, 564 F.2d 417, 429 (D.C. Cir. 1977). In turn, DOL has the authority to make the two determinations listed in section 212(a)(14). *Id.* at 423. The necessary result of these two grants of authority is that section 212(a)(14) determinations are not subject to review by INS absent fraud or willful misrepresentation, but all matters relating to preference classification eligibility not expressly delegated to DOL remain within INS' authority.

* * *

Given the language of the Act, the totality of the legislative history, and the agencies' own interpretations of their duties under the Act, we must conclude that Congress did not intend DOL to have primary authority to make any determinations other than the two stated in section 212(a)(14). If DOL is to analyze alien qualifications, it is for the purpose of "matching" them with those of corresponding United States workers so that it will then be "in a position to meet the requirement of the law," namely the section 212(a)(14) determinations.

Madany v. Smith, 696 F.2d 1008, 1012-1013 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

In 1991, when the final rule for 8 C.F.R. § 204.5 was published in the Federal Register, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (the Service), responded to criticism that the regulation required an alien to have a bachelor's degree as a minimum and that the regulation did not allow for the substitution of experience for education. After reviewing section 121 of the Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-649 (1990), and the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference, the Service specifically noted that both the Act and the legislative history indicate that an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree: "[B]oth the Act and its legislative history make clear that, in order to qualify as a professional under the third classification or to have experience equating to an advanced degree under the second, *an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree.*" 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60900 (November 29, 1991)(emphasis added).

Authority to Evaluate Whether the Alien is Qualified for the Job Offered

Relying in part on *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008, the Ninth circuit stated:

[I]t appears that the DOL is responsible only for determining the availability of suitable American workers for a job and the impact of alien employment upon the domestic labor market. It does not appear that the DOL's role extends to determining if the alien is qualified for the job for which he seeks sixth preference status. That determination appears to be delegated to the INS under section 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), as one of the determinations incident to the INS's decision whether the alien is entitled to sixth preference status.

K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1983). The court relied on an amicus brief from DOL that stated the following:

The labor certification made by the Secretary of Labor ... pursuant to section 212(a)(14) of the ... [Act] ... is binding as to the findings of whether there are able, willing, qualified, and available United States workers for the job offered to the alien, and whether employment of the alien under the terms set by the employer would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed United States workers. *The labor certification in no way indicates that the alien offered the certified job opportunity is qualified (or not qualified) to perform the duties of that job.*

(Emphasis added.) *Id.* at 1009. The Ninth Circuit, citing *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006, revisited this issue, stating:

The Department of Labor ("DOL") must certify that insufficient domestic workers are available to perform the job and that the alien's performance of the job will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed domestic workers. *Id.* § 212(a)(14), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(14). The INS then makes its own determination of the alien's entitlement to sixth preference status. *Id.* § 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). *See generally K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 9th Cir.1983).

The INS, therefore, may make a de novo determination of whether the alien is in fact qualified to fill the certified job offer.

Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman, 736 F. 2d 1305, 1309 (9th Cir. 1984).

We are cognizant of the recent decision in *Grace Korean United Methodist Church v. Michael Chertoff*, CV 04-1849-PK (D. Ore. November 3, 2005), which finds that Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) "does not have the authority or expertise to impose its strained definition of 'B.A. or equivalent' on that term as set forth in the labor certification." In contrast to the broad precedential authority of the case law of a United States circuit court, the AAO is not bound to follow the published decision of a United States district court in matters arising within the same district. *See Matter of K-S-*, 20 I&N Dec. 715 (BIA 1993). Although the reasoning underlying a district judge's decision will be given due consideration when it is properly before the AAO, the analysis does not have to be followed as a matter of law. *Id.* at 719. The court in *Grace Korean* makes no attempt to distinguish its holding from the Circuit Court decisions cited above. Instead, as legal support for its determination, the court cited to a case holding that the United States Postal Service has no expertise or special competence in immigration matters. *Grace Korean United Methodist Church* at 8 (citing *Tovar v. U.S. Postal Service*, 3 F.3d 1271, 1276 (9th Cir. 1993)). On its face, *Tovar* is easily distinguishable from the present matter since CIS, through the authority delegated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, is

charged by statute with the enforcement of the United States immigration laws and not with the delivery of mail. See section 103(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a).

Additionally, we also note the recent decision in *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, CV 06-65-MO (D. Ore. November 30, 2006). In that case, the labor certification application specified an educational requirement of four years of college and a 'B.S. or foreign equivalent.' The district court determined that 'B.S. or foreign equivalent' relates solely to the alien's educational background, precluding consideration of the alien's combined education and work experience. *Snapnames.com, Inc.* at 11-13. Additionally, the court determined that the word 'equivalent' in the employer's educational requirements was ambiguous and that in the context of skilled worker petitions (where there is no statutory educational requirement), deference must be given to the employer's intent. *Snapnames.com, Inc.* at 14. However, in professional and advanced degree professional cases, where the beneficiary is statutorily required to hold a baccalaureate degree, the court determined that CIS properly concluded that a single foreign degree or its equivalent is required. *Snapnames.com, Inc.* at 17, 19. In the instant case, unlike the labor certification in *Snapnames.com, Inc.*, the petitioner's intent regarding educational equivalence is clearly stated.

The key to determining the job qualifications is found on Form ETA-750 Part A. This section of the application for alien labor certification, "Offer of Employment," describes the terms and conditions of the job offered. It is important that the ETA-750 be read as a whole. The instructions for the Form ETA 750A, item 14, provide:

Minimum Education, Training, and Experience Required to Perform the Job Duties. Do not duplicate the time requirements. For example, time required in training should not also be listed in education or experience. Indicate whether months or years are required. Do not include restrictive requirements which are not actual business necessities for performance on the job and which would limit consideration of otherwise qualified U.S. workers.

Regarding the minimum level of education and experience required for the proffered position in this matter, Part A of the labor certification, as filled in by the petitioner, reflects the following requirements:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 14. Education (number of years) | |
| Grade School | C |
| High School | C |
| College | C |
| College Degree Required | Bachelors Degree or Foreign Equivalent |
| Major Field of Study | Business Administration or related |

Moreover, to determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for a preference immigrant visa, CIS must ascertain whether the alien is, in fact, qualified for the certified job. CIS will not accept a degree equivalency or an unrelated degree when a labor certification plainly and expressly requires a candidate with a specific degree. In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, CIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. CIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. See *Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant*, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm. 1986). See also, *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008; *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006; *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

Once again, we are cognizant of the recent holding in *Grace Korean*, which held that CIS is bound by the employer's definition of "bachelor or equivalent." In reaching this decision, the court concluded that the employer in that case tailored the job requirements to the employee and that DOL would have considered the

beneficiary's credentials in evaluating the job requirements listed on the labor certification. As stated above, the reasoning underlying a district judge's decision will be given due consideration when it is properly before the AAO, but the analysis does not have to be followed as a matter of law. *K.S.* 20 I&N Dec. at 719. In this matter, the court's reasoning cannot be followed as it is inconsistent with the actual practice at DOL. Regardless, that decision is easily distinguished because it involved a lesser classification, skilled workers as defined in section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act. The court in *Grace Korean* specifically noted that the skilled worker classification does not require an actual degree.

As discussed above, the role of the DOL in the employment-based immigration process is to make two determinations: (i) that there are not sufficient U.S. workers who are able, willing, qualified and available to do the job in question at the time of application for labor certification and in the place where the alien is to perform the job, and (ii) that the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed U.S. workers. Section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act. Beyond this, Congress did not intend DOL to have primary authority to make any other determinations in the immigrant petition process. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1013. As discussed above, CIS, not DOL, has final authority with regard to determining an alien's qualifications for an immigrant preference status. *K.R.K Irvine*, 699 F.2d at 1009 FN5 (citing *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1011-13). This authority encompasses the evaluation of the alien's credentials in relation to the minimum requirements for the job, even though a labor certification has been issued by DOL. *Id.*

Specifically, as quoted above, the regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.21(b)(6) requires the employer to "clearly document . . . that all U.S. workers who applied for the position were rejected for lawful job related reasons." BALCA has held that an employer cannot simply reject a U.S. worker that meets the minimum requirements specified on the Form ETA-750. See *American Café*, 1990 INA 26 (BALCA 1991), *Fritz Garage*, 1988 INA 98 (BALCA 1988), and *Vanguard Jewelry Corp.* 1988 INA 273 (BALCA 1988). Thus, the court's suggestion in *Grace Korean* that the employer tailored the job requirements to the alien instead of the job offered actually implies that the recruitment was unlawful. If, in fact, DOL is looking at whether the job requirements are unduly restrictive and whether U.S. applicants met the job requirements on the Form ETA 750, instead of whether the alien meets them, it becomes immediately relevant whether DOL considers "B.A. or equivalent" to require a U.S. bachelor degree or a foreign degree that is equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree. We are satisfied that DOL's interpretation matches our own. In reaching this conclusion, we rely on the reasoning articulated in *Hong Video Technology*, 1998 INA 202 (BALCA 2001). That case involved a labor certification that required a "B.S. or equivalent." The Certifying Officer questioned this requirement as the correct minimum for the job as the alien did not possess a Bachelor of Science degree. In rebuttal, the employer's attorney asserted that the beneficiary had the equivalent of a Bachelor of Science degree as demonstrated through a combination of work experience and formal education. The Certifying Officer concluded that "a combination of education and experience to meet educational requirements is unacceptable as it is unfavorable to U.S. workers." BALCA concluded:

We have held in *Francis Kellogg, et als.*, 94-INA-465, 94 INA-544, 95-INA-68 (Feb. 2, 1998 (en banc) that where, as here, the alien does not meet the primary job requirements, but only potentially qualifies for the job because the employer has chose to list alternative job requirements, the employer's alternative requirements are unlawfully tailored to the alien's qualifications, in violation of [20 C.F.R.] § 656.21(b)(5), unless the employer has indicated that applicants with any suitable combination of education, training or experience are acceptable. Therefore, the employer's alternative requirements are unlawfully tailored to the alien's qualifications, in violation of [20 C.F.R.] § 65[6].21(b)(5).

In as much as Employer's stated minimum requirement was a "B.S. or equivalent" degree in Electronic Technology or Education Technology and the Alien did not meet that requirement, labor certification was properly denied.

Significantly, when DOL raises the issue of the alien's qualifications, it is to question whether the Form ETA-750 properly represents the job qualifications for the position offered. DOL is not reaching a decision as to whether the alien is qualified for the job specified on the Form ETA 750, a determination reserved to CIS for the reasons discussed above. Thus, DOL's certification of an application for labor certification does not bind us in determinations of whether the alien is qualified for the job specified. As quoted above, DOL has conceded as much in an amicus brief filed with a federal court. If we were to accept the employer's definition of "or equivalent," instead of the definition DOL uses, we would allow the employer to "unlawfully" tailor the job requirements to the alien's credentials after DOL has already made a determination on this issue based on its own definitions. We would also undermine the labor certification process. Specifically, the employer could have lawfully excluded a U.S. applicant that possesses experience and education "equivalent" to a degree at the recruitment stage as represented to DOL.

Finally, where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by professional regulation, CIS must examine "the language of the labor certification job requirements" in order to determine what the petition beneficiary must demonstrate to be found qualified for the position. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. The only rational manner by which CIS can be expected to interpret the meaning of terms used to describe the requirements of a job in a labor certification is to "examine the certified job offer *exactly* as it is completed by the prospective employer." *Rosedale Linden Park Company v. Smith*, 595 F. Supp. 829, 833 (D.D.C. 1984)(emphasis added). CIS's interpretation of the job's requirements, as stated on the labor certification must involve "reading and applying *the plain language* of the [labor certification application form]." *Id.* at 834 (emphasis added). CIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that DOL has formally issued or otherwise attempt to divine the employer's intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

In this case, instant petition contains a position that qualifies in the skilled worker category. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3)(B) provides that a petition for an alien in this classification "must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and other requirements of the individual labor certification." As noted previously, the certified Form ETA 750 requires a Bachelor's degree or foreign equivalent in business administration or related field. The singular degree requirement is not applicable to skilled workers and the regulation governing skilled workers only requires that the beneficiary meet the requirements of the labor certification. As previously discussed, EDGE confirms that ICAI associate membership upon passing the ICAI final examination represents attainment of a level of education comparable to a bachelor's degree in the United States. All the educational evaluations from ECE, e-ValReports and CCI concur with EDGE and evaluated the beneficiary's ICAI final examination and associate membership as the equivalent to a US bachelor's degree in business administration with a major in accounting. The record contains documentary evidence showing the beneficiary in the instant case passed the ICAI final exam and was awarded a certificate of membership as an associate of the ICAI. Therefore, the AAO finds that the beneficiary holds an equivalent to a US bachelor's degree in business administration with a major in accounting and thus, meets the educational requirements specifically set forth on the certified labor certification as a skilled worker in the instant case. This ground of the director's denial is withdrawn.

For the reasons discussed above, the assertions of counsel on appeal and the evidence submitted on appeal are sufficient to overcome the basis of denial in the decision of the director. The petitioner has demonstrated that as of the priority date the beneficiary had the requisite foreign equivalent to the U.S. bachelor's degree in business administration with a major in accounting, as set forth on the Form ETA 750 as certified under the skilled worker

category. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). See also *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

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 met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The petition is approved under the skilled category.