

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

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



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

**PUBLIC COPY**

B6



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date **SEP 29 2010**

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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. §103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

*Perry Rhew for*

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based immigrant 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 dismissed.

The petitioner is a public school district. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a special education teacher. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL).

The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition, and had not established that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position with a Bachelor's Degree in Special Education and Special Education credentials. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and timely. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's July 22, 2009 denial, the issues in this case are (1) whether or not the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence, and (2) whether or not the petitioner has demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position.

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 nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), also provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.<sup>1</sup> See also 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(b). See also 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states in pertinent part:

*Ability of prospective employer to pay wage.* Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Part I, Item 1, of the ETA Form 9089 states that the position is a professional occupation. Teachers in elementary or secondary schools are statutorily defined as professionals. Section 101(a)(32) of the Act.

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the ETA Form 9089 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The petitioner must also demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its ETA Form 9089 as certified by the DOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

Here, the ETA Form 9089 was accepted on May 26, 2008, and the proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is [REDACTED]. The Form ETA 9089 states that the position requires a Bachelor's Degree in Special Education and Special Education credentials.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>2</sup>

On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1966, and to currently employ 1,280 employees. While 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) provides that the director may accept a statement from a financial officer of the organization employing 100 or more workers which establishes its ability to pay the proffered wage, the petitioner did not submit such a letter.

On appeal, counsel provides a brief statement asserting:

- Petitioner provided certified Labor Certification with I-140 petition within six months of certification as required by law.
- USCIS did not request further information as to the petitioner's ability to pay salary.
- Petitioner is a public school district with several hundred employees and therefore presumptively has the ability to pay one teacher's salary.
- Beneficiary is a Special Ed teacher whose services are in short supply.
- Petitioner is prepared to show upon appeal that it is able to pay salary and has been paying the beneficiary at or above the prevailing wage for the past year.

In support of the appeal counsel submits a [REDACTED] – Detail” for the beneficiary dated January 2006 through July 2009.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA Form 9089 labor certification application establishes a priority date for any immigrant

---

<sup>2</sup> 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).

petition later based on the ETA Form 9089, the petitioner must establish that the job offer was realistic as of the priority date and that the offer remained realistic for each year thereafter, until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. The petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is an essential element in evaluating whether a job offer is realistic. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In evaluating whether a job offer is realistic, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) requires the petitioner to demonstrate financial resources sufficient to pay the beneficiary's proffered wages, although the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning business will be considered if the evidence warrants such consideration. *See Matter of Sonegawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary during the requisite period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. In this case, the documentation submitted on appeal reflects that the petitioner paid the beneficiary gross wages of [REDACTED] in 2008. Thus, the petitioner has established that it employed and paid the beneficiary at a salary greater than the proffered wage in 2008. The petitioner has established its ability to pay the proffered wage. Therefore, the director's decision to deny the application for failure to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage will be withdrawn.

However, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position.

To determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for an employment based immigrant visa, USCIS must examine whether the alien's credentials meet the requirements set forth in the labor certification. In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS 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, Mandany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008, (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

The petitioner must demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its labor certification application, as certified by the DOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). As previously stated, the labor certification application was accepted on May 26, 2008.

According to the plain terms of the labor certification, the beneficiary must have a Bachelor's Degree in Special Education and Special Education credentials. The regulations define a third preference category professional as a "qualified alien who holds at least a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and who is a member of the professions." *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii) specifies for the classification of a professional that:

(C) *Professionals*. 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 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 showing that the minimum of a baccalaureate degree is required for entry into the occupation.

There is no evidence contained in the record to establish that the beneficiary has the required qualifications. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Specifically, the record does not contain the beneficiary's Bachelor's Degree in Special Education, or evidence that the beneficiary has the required Special Education credentials.

It is noted that DOL's certification of the Form ETA 750 does not supercede USCIS' review and evaluation of the criteria the petitioner must prove in order to establish that the petition is approvable, and that includes a review of the whether or not the beneficiary is qualified for the proffered position, which in this case, is governed by 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3). 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 a Bachelor's Degree in Special Education and Special Education credentials. See *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. at 158.

Based on the evidence submitted, the AAO affirms in part and withdraws in part the decision of the director. The petitioner has established its ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition; however, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position.

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.