

(b)(6)

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

DATE: **AUG 23 2013**

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

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:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg  
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 on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks classification as an “alien of extraordinary ability” as a chess player, pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A). The director determined the petitioner had not established the sustained national or international acclaim necessary to qualify for the classification.

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 of 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.

The petitioner’s priority date established by the petition filing date is March 19, 2012. On August 3, 2012, the director served the petitioner with a request for evidence (RFE). After receiving the petitioner’s response to the RFE, the director issued his decision on December 19, 2012. On appeal, the petitioner submits a brief with additional documentary evidence. For the reasons discussed below, the record supports the director’s ultimate determination that the petitioner has not established his eligibility for the classification sought.

## 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.*; 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2).

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

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.<sup>1</sup> 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)).

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 this matter, the AAO will review the evidence under the plain language requirements of each criterion claimed. As the petitioner did not submit qualifying evidence under at least three criteria, the proper conclusion is that the petitioner has failed to satisfy the regulatory requirement of three types of evidence. *Id.*

---

<sup>1</sup> 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

### Evidentiary Criteria<sup>2</sup>

*Documentation of the alien's receipt of lesser nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards for excellence in the field of endeavor.*

This criterion contains several evidentiary elements the petitioner must satisfy. According to the plain language of the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i), the evidence must establish that the alien is the recipient of the prizes or the awards (in the plural). The clear regulatory language requires that the prizes or the awards are nationally or internationally recognized. The plain language of the regulation also requires the petitioner to submit evidence that each prize or award is one for excellence in the field of endeavor rather than simply for participating in or contributing to an event or to a group. The petitioner must satisfy all of these elements to meet the plain language requirements of this criterion.

The petitioner claimed that the success of the [REDACTED] chess team sufficiently demonstrates his eligibility under this criterion in addition to his placement in various tournaments. The director determined that the petitioner failed to meet the requirements of this criterion. The record does not support the director's adverse eligibility determination related to this criterion for the reasons outlined below.

The petitioner submitted photographs of trophies and plaques, all of which are either illegible, in a foreign language and lack translations as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3), or are for awards for which the petitioner has not documented their level of recognition in the field. This evidence is not probative of the petitioner's receipt of qualifying awards. Notwithstanding these deficiencies, the petitioner also documented that his collegiate chess team received the championship [REDACTED] in 2009 and 2010. The event's website lists the five members of the team, including the petitioner, in announcing the final standings. As the petitioner was a credited member of the team that received this top-level collegiate award on two occasions, the petitioner has demonstrated that he is a recipient of these awards. The petitioner also individually finished first in the 2009 [REDACTED] event.

As such, the petitioner has submitted evidence that meets the plain language requirements of this criterion.

---

<sup>2</sup> The petitioner does not claim to meet or submit evidence relating to the regulatory categories of evidence not discussed in this decision.

*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.*

This criterion contains several evidentiary elements the petitioner must satisfy. First, the petitioner must demonstrate that he is a member of more than one association in his field. Second, the petitioner must demonstrate both of the following: (1) that the associations utilize nationally or internationally recognized experts to judge the achievements (in the plural) of prospective members to determine if the achievements are outstanding, and (2) that the associations use this outstanding determination as a condition of eligibility for prospective membership. It is insufficient for the association itself to determine if the achievements were outstanding, unless nationally or internationally recognized experts in the petitioner's field, who represent the association, render this determination. It is also insufficient for the petitioner to claim that he was admitted to the association because of his outstanding achievements; the petitioner must show that the association requires outstanding achievements of all prospective members. The petitioner must satisfy all of these elements to meet the plain language requirements of this criterion.

The petitioner claimed that his [REDACTED] title constitutes a membership in the Federation [REDACTED]. The director determined that the petitioner failed to meet the requirements of this criterion.

The petitioner did not provide evidence of his membership in [REDACTED] admits individuals as members. The petitioner also failed to submit the membership requirements for [REDACTED] or a member federation to demonstrate that it might satisfy the requirements under this criterion. The petitioner's attainment of the [REDACTED] also fails to meet the plain language requirements of this criterion. Specifically, a title from an association is not a membership in an association. Even if the petitioner established that the [REDACTED] title was a membership within a qualifying association, this would only be a single membership when the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(ii) requires evidence of "membership in associations" in the plural, consistent with the statutory requirement for extensive documentation. See section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act.

Consequently, the petitioner has not submitted evidence that meets the plain language requirements of this criterion.

*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.*

This criterion contains three evidentiary requirements the petitioner must satisfy. First, the published material must be about the petitioner and the contents must relate to the petitioner's work in the field under which he seeks classification as an immigrant. The published material must also appear in professional or major trade publications or other major media (in the plural). Professional or major trade publications are intended for experts in the field or in the industry. To qualify as major media, the

publication should have significant national or international distribution and be published in a predominant national language. The final requirement is that the petitioner provide each published item's title, date, and author and if the published item is in a foreign language, the petitioner must provide a translation that complies with the requirements found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3). The petitioner must submit evidence satisfying all of these elements to meet the plain language requirements of this criterion.

The petitioner provided several articles, primarily relating to the [REDACTED] and events where the team competed. The director determined that the petitioner failed to meet the requirements of this criterion because the articles were not about the petitioner.

The articles under this criterion must be about the petitioner and relate to his work in the field. The articles in the record are about the [REDACTED] team or events where the team competed. Counsel's brief on appeal asserts that the articles should be read in concert with the team's results because the petitioner was an integral part of the team and the articles should be viewed as outlining the petitioner's personal success. The plain language requirements of this criterion, however, explicitly state that the published material must be about the petitioner. Articles that are not about the petitioner, and only mention him in passing, do not meet this regulatory criterion. *See, e.g., Negro-Plumpe v. Okin*, 2:07-CV-820-ECR-RJJ at \*1, \*7 (D. Nev. Sept. 8, 2008) (upholding a finding that articles about a show or a character within a show are not about the performer).

Therefore, the petitioner has not submitted evidence that meets the plain language requirements of this criterion.

### Summary

The petitioner has failed to satisfy the antecedent regulatory requirement of three types of evidence.

### III. CONCLUSION

The documentation submitted in support of a claim of extraordinary ability must clearly demonstrate that the alien has achieved sustained national or international acclaim and is one of the small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor.

Had the petitioner submitted the requisite evidence under at least three evidentiary categories, in accordance with the *Kazarian* opinion, the next step would be 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" 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." 8 C.F.R. §§ 204.5(h)(2) and (3); *see also Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1119-20. While the AAO concludes that the evidence is not indicative of a level of expertise consistent with the small percentage at the very top of the field or sustained national or international acclaim, the AAO need not explain that conclusion in a

final merits determination.<sup>3</sup> Rather, the proper conclusion is that the petitioner has failed to satisfy the antecedent regulatory requirement of three types of evidence. *Id.* at 1122.

The petitioner has not established eligibility pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act and the petition may not be approved.

The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternate basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>3</sup> The AAO maintains de novo review of all questions of fact and law. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). In any future proceeding, the AAO maintains the jurisdiction to conduct a final merits determination as the office that made the last decision in this matter. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). *See also* section 103(a)(1) of the Act; section 204(b) of the Act; DHS Delegation Number 0150.1 (effective March 1, 2003); 8 C.F.R. § 2.1 (2003); 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii) (2003); *Matter of Aurelio*, 19 I&N Dec. 458, 460 (BIA 1987) (holding that legacy INS, now USCIS, is the sole authority with the jurisdiction to decide visa petitions).