


PUBLIC COPY



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**


**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



DL4

FILE: EAC 05 040 53706 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **JUL 14 2005**

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant 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 engages in the business of rubbish collection. It desires to employ the beneficiaries as garbage collectors for nine months. The director determined that the petitioner had not submitted a temporary labor certification from the Department of Labor (DOL) or notice stating that such certification could not be made and denied the petition.

On appeal, the petitioner states that she did not know that filing the petition before receiving the labor certification was not acceptable. The petitioner states that it was her understanding that she would receive a letter requesting additional information or a date by which she should mail a copy of the labor certification.

Upon review, the director erred in denying the petition without issuing a request for evidence for the labor certification or notice detailing why the certification could not be made. The director should have afforded the petitioner an opportunity to provide the temporary labor certification. Nevertheless, the AAO will not remand this matter to the service center to allow the petitioner to submit the temporary labor certification, as the final determination notice and a copy of labor certification is contained in the record of proceeding.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(iii) states in pertinent part:

(C) The petitioner may not file an H-2B petition unless the United States petitioner has applied for a labor certification with the Secretary of Labor . . . within the time limits prescribed or accepted by each, and has obtained a labor certification determination as required by paragraph (h)(6)(iv). . . .

The regulations stipulate that an H-2B petition for temporary employment in the United States shall be accompanied by a labor certification determination that is either: (1) a certification from the Secretary of Labor stating that qualified workers in the United States are not available and that the alien's employment will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of similarly employed United States workers; or (2) a notice detailing the reasons why such certification cannot be made. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(iv)(A).

The Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129) was filed on November 17, 2004 without a temporary labor certification, or notice detailing the reasons why such certification cannot be made. Absent such certification from the Department of Labor or notice detailing the reasons why such certification cannot be made, the petition cannot be approved.

The final determination notice from the DOL is dated January 21, 2005 and a copy of the original approved labor certification is valid from March 15, 2005 through December 15, 2005. Although the petitioner applied for a temporary labor certification on November 15, 2004, prior to the filing of the petition, a determination was not rendered until January 21, 2005, subsequent to the petition's filing date.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(iii)(E) states that:

After obtaining a determination from the Secretary of Labor or the Governor of Guam, as appropriate, the petitioner shall file a petition on I-129, accompanied by the labor certification determination and supporting documents, with the director having jurisdiction in the area of intended employment.

Neither the statute nor regulations allow for the acceptance of a labor certification obtained subsequent to the filing of the petition. The petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978).

The petitioner also asserts that there are 15 other companies that she knows of that have filed in this manner, this same year and were approved. However, each nonimmigrant proceeding is a separate proceeding with a separate record. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(d). If the prior nonimmigrant petitions were approved based on the same set of facts that are contained in the current record, the approval would constitute material and gross error on the part of the director. The AAO is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. See, e.g. *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 597 (Comm.1988). It would be absurd to suggest that CIS or any agency must treat acknowledged errors as binding precedent. *Sussex Engg. Ltd v. Montgomery*, 825 F.2d 1084, 1090 (6th Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 485 U.S. 1008 (1988). Moreover, the AAO is not bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. *Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS*, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D. La.), *aff'd*, 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S. Ct 51 (2001).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the petitioner has not met that burden.

This decision is without prejudice to the filing of a new petition accompanied by the proper documentation and fee.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.