

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

[Redacted]

B2

DATE: NOV 21 2011

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [Redacted]

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

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Alien of Extraordinary Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[Redacted]

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.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The petitioner seeks classification as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A), as an alien of extraordinary ability in the sciences. The director determined that the petitioner had not established the requisite extraordinary ability through extensive documentation and sustained national or international acclaim.

Congress set a very high benchmark for aliens of extraordinary ability by requiring through the statute that the petitioner demonstrate the alien's "sustained national or international acclaim" and present "extensive documentation" of the alien's achievements. *See* section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). The implementing regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) states that an alien can establish sustained national or international acclaim through evidence of a one-time achievement, specifically a major, internationally recognized award. Absent the receipt of such an award, the regulation outlines ten categories of specific objective evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i) through (x). The petitioner must submit qualifying evidence under at least three of the ten regulatory categories of evidence to establish the basic eligibility requirements.

On appeal, counsel argues that the petitioner meets the categories of evidence at 8 C.F.R. §§ 204.5(h)(3)(iv), (v), and (vi). For the reasons discussed below, the AAO finds that the petitioner meets the statutory and regulatory requirements for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability.

I. Law

Section 203(b) of the Act states, in pertinent part, that:

(1) Priority workers. -- Visas shall first be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are aliens described in any of the following subparagraphs (A) through (C):

(A) Aliens with extraordinary ability. -- An alien is described in this subparagraph if --

(i) the alien has extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in the field through extensive documentation,

(ii) the alien seeks to enter the United States to continue work in the area of extraordinary ability, and

(iii) the alien's entry into the United States will substantially benefit prospectively the United States.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) and legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) have consistently recognized that Congress intended to set a very high standard for individuals seeking immigrant visas as aliens of extraordinary ability. *See* H.R. 723 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 59 (1990); 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60898-99 (Nov. 29, 1991). The term “extraordinary ability” refers only to those individuals in that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor. *Id.* and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) requires that an alien demonstrate his or her sustained acclaim and the recognition of his or her achievements in the field. Such acclaim and achievements must be established either through evidence of a one-time achievement (that is, a major, international recognized award) or through meeting at least three of the following ten categories of evidence:

- (i) Documentation of the alien’s receipt of lesser nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards for excellence in the field of endeavor;
- (ii) Documentation of the alien’s membership in associations in the field for which classification is sought, which require outstanding achievements of their members, as judged by recognized national or international experts in their disciplines or fields;
- (iii) Published material about the alien in professional or major trade publications or other major media, relating to the alien’s work in the field for which classification is sought. Such evidence shall include the title, date, and author of the material, and any necessary translation;
- (iv) Evidence of the alien’s participation, either individually or on a panel, as a judge of the work of others in the same or an allied field of specialization for which classification is sought;
- (v) Evidence of the alien’s original scientific, scholarly, artistic, athletic, or business-related contributions of major significance in the field;
- (vi) Evidence of the alien’s authorship of scholarly articles in the field, in professional or major trade publications or other major media;
- (vii) Evidence of the display of the alien’s work in the field at artistic exhibitions or showcases;
- (viii) Evidence that the alien has performed in a leading or critical role for organizations or establishments that have a distinguished reputation;
- (ix) Evidence that the alien has commanded a high salary or other significantly high remuneration for services, in relation to others in the field; or

(x) Evidence of commercial successes in the performing arts, as shown by box office receipts or record, cassette, compact disk, or video sales.

In 2010, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Ninth Circuit) reviewed the denial of a petition filed under this classification. *Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2010). Although the court upheld the AAO's decision to deny the petition, the court took issue with the AAO's evaluation of evidence submitted to meet a given evidentiary criterion.¹ With respect to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv) and (vi), the court concluded that while USCIS may have raised legitimate concerns about the significance of the evidence submitted to meet those two criteria, those concerns should have been raised in a subsequent "final merits determination." *Id.* at 1121-22.

The court stated that the AAO's evaluation rested on an improper understanding of the regulations. Instead of parsing the significance of evidence as part of the initial inquiry, the court stated that "the proper procedure is to count the types of evidence provided (which the AAO did)," and if the petitioner failed to submit sufficient evidence, "the proper conclusion is that the applicant has failed to satisfy the regulatory requirement of three types of evidence (as the AAO concluded)." *Id.* at 1122 (citing to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)). The court also explained the "final merits determination" as the corollary to this procedure:

If a petitioner has submitted the requisite evidence, USCIS determines whether the evidence demonstrates both a "level of expertise indicating that the individual is one of that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the[ir] field of endeavor," 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2), and "that the alien has sustained national or international acclaim and that his or her achievements have been recognized in the field of expertise." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). Only aliens whose achievements have garnered "sustained national or international acclaim" are eligible for an "extraordinary ability" visa. 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)(i).

Id. at 1119-20.

Thus, *Kazarian* sets forth a two-part approach where the evidence is first counted and then considered in the context of a final merits determination. In reviewing Service Center decisions, the AAO will apply the test set forth in *Kazarian*. As the AAO maintains *de novo* review, the AAO will conduct a new analysis if the director reached his or her conclusion by using a one-step analysis rather than the two-step analysis dictated by the *Kazarian* court. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

¹ Specifically, the court stated that the AAO had unilaterally imposed novel substantive or evidentiary requirements beyond those set forth in the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv) and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vi).

II. Analysis

A. Evidentiary Criteria

This petition, filed on February 16, 2010, seeks to classify the petitioner as an alien with extraordinary ability as a glycobiology researcher. At the time of filing the petition, the petitioner was working as a Senior Scientist at [REDACTED]. The AAO finds that the petitioner's evidence meets at least three of the following categories of evidence under 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

Evidence of the alien's participation, either individually or on a panel, as a judge of the work of others in the same or an allied field of specification for which classification is sought.

The petitioner submitted documentation showing that he served as a peer reviewer for multiple scientific journals and that he reviewed research grant proposals for the [REDACTED].

Accordingly, the petitioner has established that he meets this criterion.

Evidence of the alien's original scientific, scholarly, artistic, athletic, or business-related contributions of major significance in the field.

The petitioner submitted letters of support from experts in the field discussing the significance of his original research contributions. The experts' statements do not merely reiterate the regulatory language of this criterion, they clearly describe how the petitioner's scientific contributions are both original and of major significance in the field. For instance, several of the experts provide specific examples of how the petitioner's work is being applied by others in the field. Moreover, in support of the experts' statements, the petitioner submitted citation evidence showing hundreds of cites to his published findings. These citations are solid evidence that other researchers have been influenced by his work and are familiar with it. This evidence corroborates the scientific experts' statements that the petitioner has made original contributions of major significance in his field. The petitioner also submitted evidence showing that his research findings have been reported by [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] The record reflects that the petitioner's contributions are important not only to the institutions where he has worked, but throughout the greater field as well. Leading scientists and news media from around the world have acknowledged the value of the petitioner's work and its major significance in the field of glycobiology. Accordingly, the petitioner has established that he meets this criterion.

Evidence of the alien's authorship of scholarly articles in the field, in professional or major trade publications or other major media.

The petitioner submitted evidence of his authorship of numerous articles in scientific journals such as [REDACTED].

Sciences of the United States of America, Nature Biotechnology, Biochemistry, and Journal of Biochemistry. Accordingly, the petitioner has established that he meets this criterion.

In this case, the petitioner meets at least three of the ten categories of evidence that must be satisfied to establish the minimum eligibility requirements necessary to qualify as an alien of extraordinary ability. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

B. Final Merits Determination

The AAO will next conduct a final merits determination that considers all of the evidence in the context of whether or not the petitioner has demonstrated: (1) a “level of expertise indicating that the individual is one of that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the[ir] field of endeavor,” 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2); and (2) “that the alien has sustained national or international acclaim and that his or her achievements have been recognized in the field of expertise.” Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). *See also Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1119-20.

In this case, the petitioner has submitted extensive documentation of his achievements in the field of glycobiology and has demonstrated a “career of acclaimed work in the field” as contemplated by Congress. [REDACTED]. The submitted evidence is sufficient to demonstrate the petitioner’s sustained national or international acclaim as a research scientist and that his achievements have been recognized in the field of expertise. His previous research institutions include [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The petitioner currently works for [REDACTED] as a Senior Scientist. The petitioner has served as a peer reviewer for multiple journals and has reviewed research grant proposals for the [REDACTED].

Further, the petitioner submitted reference letters from experts in the field, detailing his specific contributions and explaining how those contributions have influenced the field. Moreover, the petitioner’s publication record of numerous journal articles and three book chapters at the time of filing the petition not only meets the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vi), his articles are consistently well cited, with hundreds of independent citations to his body of work as of the petition’s filing date. *See Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1121 (citations may be relevant to the final merits determination of whether an alien is at the very top of his field). This citation record is also consistent with a determination that his original contributions of major significance, discussed in detail in the reference letters, are indicative of national or international acclaim. Thus, the petitioner’s achievements are commensurate with sustained national or international acclaim at the very top of his field.

III. Conclusion

In review, the petitioner has submitted evidence qualifying under at least three of the ten categories of evidence and established “a level of expertise indicating that the individual is one of that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the[ir] field of endeavor” and “sustained national or international acclaim.” His achievements have been recognized in his field of expertise. The petitioner has established that he seeks to continue working in the same field in the United States. The petitioner has established that his entry into the United States will

substantially benefit prospectively the United States. Therefore, the petitioner has established eligibility for the benefit sought under section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act.

The burden of proof in visa petition proceedings remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has sustained that burden.

ORDER: The decision of the director is withdrawn. The appeal is sustained and the petition is approved.