identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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

B6

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 28 2010

IN RE: Petitioner: 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:

[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.

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 $630. 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
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is an Indian restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a chef. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750,[1] Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor (the DOL), accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary satisfied the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. 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. The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.[2]

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.

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 Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). The priority date of the petition is March 26, 2003, which is the date the labor certification was accepted for processing by the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).[3] The Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140) was filed on September 15, 2006.

---

[1] After March 28, 2005, the correct form to apply for labor certification is the Form ETA 9089. *See* 69 Fed. Reg. 77325, 77326 (Dec. 27, 2004).

[2] 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).

[3] If the petition is approved, the priority date is also used in conjunction with the Visa Bulletin issued by the Department of State to determine when a beneficiary can apply for adjustment of status or for an immigrant visa abroad. Thus, the importance of reviewing the *bona fides* of a job opportunity as of the priority date is clear.

The job qualifications for the certified position of chef are found on Form ETA 750 Part A. Item 13 describes the job duties to be performed as follows:

> Prepare meals for the patrons of the restaurant, specifically prepare Moghlai, Lucknowi, and Tandoori cuisines. Plan menus and cater to parties. Also prepare Indian desserts for patrons and catered parties.

The minimum education, training, experience and skills required to perform the duties of the offered position are set forth at Part A of the labor certification and reflects the following requirements:

Block 14:

Education (number of years)

Grade school	*
High school	*
College	4
College Degree Required	Bachelor of Arts or foreign equivalent
Major Field of Study	Culinary Art or related field

Experience:

Job Offered	2
(or)	
Related Occupation	*

Block 15:

Other Special Requirements: Must have knowledge of Moghlai, Lucknowi, and Tandoori cuisines. Experience in preparing Indian sweets and planning menus for restaurants.

As set forth above, the proffered position requires four years of college culminating in a Bachelor of Arts degree in Culinary Art[s] and two years of experience in the job offered as a chef.

On Part B of the labor certification, signed by the beneficiary, the beneficiary failed to list a Bachelor of Arts degree in Culinary Arts that he asserts was acquired at the [redacted] in 1989.[4] No formal education was stated on the ETA 750.

In support of the beneficiary's educational qualifications, the record contains a copy of the beneficiary's 1989 diploma from the [redacted] India. It indicates that the beneficiary

[4] The degree was not submitted until the director issued a notice of intent to deny on February 20, 2007.

was awarded a Bachelor of Arts degree in Culinary Arts on December 27, 1989. Below the designation of "Culinary Arts" as the field of study, the diploma states, "Field of Study Specialized in Indian Moglai, Tandoori Cuisine and Indian Sweets." The diploma also refers to the degree as a three-year program. The record also contains copies of three credentials evaluations that may be summarized as follows:

1) An evaluation from Professor of the American Evaluation Institute, dated June 26, 2001. Professor concludes that the beneficiary's education based on "certificates, transcripts and progressively higher employment experience" is equivalent to "An Accredited American Bachelor of Arts in Culinary Arts Degree."

2) An evaluation from Worldwide Education Evaluators, Inc., dated February 9, 2007, was submitted. It is signed by states that he has only reviewed employment documents. Using a formula that equates three years of work experience equating to one year of college, concludes that the beneficiary's professional work experience equals a four-year degree in Culinary Arts.

3) An evaluation from Josef Silny & Associates, Inc., dated May 17, 2007, was submitted and signed by and International Education Consultants and stated to be an evaluation of the beneficiary's educational credentials. These individuals concluded that the beneficiary's 1989 Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Bombay is the U.S. equivalent of the completion of three years of undergraduate study.

4) An evaluation from dated May 21, 2007, authored by an associate professor of the School of Hospitality Management of Florida International University, Professor evaluation is based on a combination of the beneficiary's education and professional experience. He does not evaluate each separately, but concludes that based on the beneficiary's combined education and experience that the beneficiary has the U.S. equivalent of a Bachelor of Science in hospitality management (BS in Culinary Arts).

The director denied the petition on April 25, 2007. The director questioned why the beneficiary did not claim to have a degree on the ETA 750 at the time that it was certified in 2003. The director noted that the petitioner provided the degree in response to the director's notice of intent to deny and not with the initial filing or in response to the request for evidence. Evaluating the beneficiary's education for classification for a professional visa category, the director determined that the beneficiary's bachelor of arts degree could not be accepted as a foreign equivalent degree to a single U.S. bachelor's degree and thus did not qualify for a professional visa classification.

On appeal, with regard to the beneficiary's qualifying academic credentials, counsel asserts that along with his bachelor's degree, the beneficiary's extensive employment experience qualified him as a member of the professions and eligibility for a visa in the professional visa category.

The occupational classification of the offered position is not one of the occupations statutorily defined as a profession at section 101(a)(32) of the Act, which states: "The term 'profession' shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academics, or seminaries."

Part A of the ETA 750 indicates that the DOL assigned the occupational code of 313.361.030 and title Cook Specialty, Foreign Food to the proffered position. The DOL's occupational codes are assigned based on normalized occupational standards. The occupational classification of the offered position is determined by the DOL (or applicable State Workforce Agency) during the labor certification process, and the applicable occupational classification code is noted on the labor certification form. O*NET is the current occupational classification system used by the DOL. Located online at http://online.onetcenter.org, O*NET is described as "the nation's primary source of occupational information, providing comprehensive information on key attributes and characteristics of workers and occupations." O*NET incorporates the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, which is designed to cover all occupations in the United States.[5]

The O*NET online database states that this occupation falls within Job Zone Two.

> According to the DOL, these occupations usually require a high school diploma. The DOL assigns a standard vocational preparation (SVP) of 4 to 6 to Job Zone two occupations, which means that employees "in these occupations need anywhere from a few months to one year of working with experience employees..."[6]

See id. Based on the DOL's standard occupational requirements, the proffered position is usually considered under the unskilled or even skilled worker category, but in this case, because of the petitioner's specific baccalaureate requirements and job duties set forth on the ETA 750 certified by DOL, as well as the petitioner's correspondence and assertions on appeal that this is a professional position, it might also be considered under 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.

---

[5] *See* http://www.bls.gov/soc/socguide.htm.

[6] *See http://online.onetcenter.org/link/summary/35-2014.00* (accessed 12/12/10).

The above regulation uses 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.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. 204(5)(l)(3)(ii)(B) states the following:

> If the petition is for a skilled worker, 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, meets the requirements for Schedule A designation, or meets the requirements for the Labor Market Information Pilot Program occupation designation. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.[7]

The above regulation requires that the alien meet the requirements of the labor certification.

Because the petition's proffered position qualifies for consideration under both the professional and skilled worker categories, the AAO will apply the regulatory requirements from both provisions to the facts of the case at hand, beginning with the professional category.

Initially, however, we will provide an explanation of the general process of procuring an employment-based immigrant visa and the roles and respective authority of both agencies involved.

As noted above, the Form ETA 750 in this matter is certified by the DOL. Thus, at the outset, it is useful to discuss the 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

---

[7] Section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii), provides for the granting of preference classification to other qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

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

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to the DOL, or the remaining regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether the position and the alien are qualified for a specific immigrant classification. 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).[8] 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).

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 the DOL that stated the following:

---

[8] Based on revisions to the Act, the current citation is section 212(a)(5)(A) as set forth above.

> 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).

Therefore, it is the DOL's responsibility to certify the terms of the labor certification, but it is the responsibility of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to determine if the petition and the alien beneficiary are eligible for the classification sought. For classification as a member of the professions, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) requires that the alien had a U.S. baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and be a member of the professions. Additionally, the regulation requires the submission of "an official *college or university* record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study." (Emphasis added.)

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).

Moreover, it is significant that both the statute, section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, and relevant regulations use the word "degree" in relation to professionals. A statute should be construed under the assumption that Congress intended it to have purpose and meaningful effect. *Mountain States Tel. & Tel. v. Pueblo of Santa Ana*, 472 U.S. 237, 249 (1985); *Sutton v. United States*, 819 F.2d. 1289m 1295 (5th Cir. 1987). It can be presumed that Congress' narrow requirement in of a "degree" for members of the professions is deliberate. Significantly, in another context, Congress has broadly referenced "the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning." Section 203(b)(2)(C) (relating to aliens of exceptional ability). Thus, the requirement at section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) that an eligible alien both have a baccalaureate "degree" and be a member of the professions reveals that a member of the professions must have a *degree* and that a diploma or certificate from an institution of learning other than a college or university is a potentially similar but distinct type of credential. Thus, even if we did not require "a" degree that is the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree, we would not consider education earned at an institution other than a college or university.

The petitioner in this matter relies on the beneficiary's combined education and an unquantifiable amount of work experience to reach the "equivalent" of a degree, which is not a bachelor's degree based on a single degree in the required field listed on the certified labor certification.

There is no provision in the statute or the regulations that would allow a beneficiary to qualify under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act with anything less than a full baccalaureate degree. More specifically, a three-year bachelor's degree will not be considered to be the "foreign equivalent degree" to a United States baccalaureate degree. A United States baccalaureate degree is generally found to require four years of education. *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. 244 (Reg. Comm. 1977). Where the analysis of the beneficiary's credentials relies on work experience alone or a combination of multiple lesser degrees, the result is the "equivalent" of a bachelor's degree rather than a single-source "foreign equivalent degree."

Because the beneficiary does not have a "United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree," from a college or university in the required field of study listed on the certified labor certification, the beneficiary does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act as he does not have the minimum level of education required for the equivalent of a bachelor's degree.

We are cognizant of the recent decision in *Grace Korean United Methodist Church v. Michael Chertoff*, 437 F. Supp. 2d 1174 (D. Or. 2005), which finds that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) "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." 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*, 437 F. Supp. 2d at 1179 (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 USCIS, 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*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. Nov. 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 USCIS 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 on the Form ETA 750 and does not specify or define alternatives to a four-year bachelor's degree. The court in *Snapnames.com, Inc.* recognized that even though the labor certification may be prepared with the alien in mind, USCIS has an independent role in determining whether the alien meets the labor certification requirements. *Id.* at *7. Thus, the court concluded that where the plain language of those requirements does not support the petitioner's asserted intent, USCIS "does not err in applying the requirements as written." *Id. See also Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act No. 06-2158 (RCL) (D.C. Cir. March 26, 2008)(upholding an interpretation that a "bachelor's or equivalent" requirement necessitated a single four-year degree). In this matter, the Form ETA 750 does not specify or define an equivalency to the requirement of four years of college culminating in a Bachelor of Arts or foreign equivalent.

Where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by professional regulation, USCIS must examine "the language of the labor certification job requirements" in order to determine what the petitioner must demonstrate about the beneficiary's qualifications. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. The only rational manner by which USCIS 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). USCIS'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). USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be

expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that the DOL has formally issued or otherwise attempt to divine the employer's intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

Further, the employer's subjective intent may not be dispositive of the meaning of the actual minimum requirements of the proffered position. *Maramjaya v. USCIS,* Civ. Act. No. 06-2158, 14 n. 7. A petitioner's intent may also be discerned in how it conducted its recruitment efforts for the proffered position. The timing of such evidence is needed to ensure inflation of those requirements is not occurring in an effort to fit the beneficiary's credentials into requirements that do not seem on their face to include what the beneficiary has.

Thus, the AAO issued a request for evidence (RFE) on June 2, 2010, soliciting such evidence. In response, the petitioner did not submit any correspondence with DOL, but supplied copies of three advertisements in the *Atlanta Journal.* They each contained identical language: "Chef/Indian cuisine, BA Culinary Art or foreign equiv, 2+yrs exp in Mohglai, Luknowi, Tandoori cuisines & Indian deserts.[sic] Must be able to plan menu."

To determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for a preference immigrant visa, USCIS must ascertain whether the alien is, in fact, qualified for the certified job. USCIS 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, 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*, *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).

As noted above, the petitioner submitted four evaluations. With the exception of the and evaluation, the other three either evaluated the beneficiary's employment experience alone and arrived at a bachelor's degree equivalency as reflected in the evaluation, or reviewed a combination of education and experience and concluded that the beneficiary had the U.S. equivalent of a bachelor's degree. It is noted that the evaluation mentioned a review of certificates, but this beneficiary had no certificates submitted to the record. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988).

The evaluation concluded that that a combination of the beneficiary's bachelor's degree and an unspecified amount of experience reflected that the beneficiary has the U.S. equivalent of a Bachelor of Science in hospitality management (BS in Culinary Arts). The USCIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert

testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, the Service is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm. 1988).

Moreover, as advised in the RFE issued to the petitioner by this office, we have reviewed the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO).[9] 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." Authors for EDGE are not merely expressing their personal opinions. Rather, they must work with a publication consultant and a Council Liaison with AACRAO's National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials. "An Author's Guide to Creating AACRAO International Publications" 5-6 (First ed. 2005), available for download at *www.aacrao.org/publications/guide to creating international publications.pdf.* If placement recommendations are included, the Council Liaison works with the author to give feedback and the publication is subject to final review by the entire Council. *Id.* at 11-12.

As noted in the request for evidence EDGE confirmed that a bachelor of arts 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, or that some kind of combination of experience and a three-year degree may be deemed a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. bachelor of arts.[10]

---

[9] In *Confluence Intern., Inc. v. Holder,* 2009 WL 825793 (D.Minn. March 27, 2009), the District Court in Minnesota determined that the AAO provided a rational explanation for its reliance on information provided by the American Association of Collegiate Registrar and Admissions Officers to support its decision.

[10] One of the evaluations in the record used the rule to equate three years of experience for one year of education, but that equivalence applies to non-immigrant H-1B petitions, not to immigrant petitions. *See* 8 CFR § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5). Additionally, this evaluation used all of the beneficiary's documented experience, so that the petitioner would be unable to document that the beneficiary had the required two years of experience as well. The petitioner may not use the beneficiary's experience to satisfy both education and experience requirements. It is further noted that this office requested that the beneficiary's diploma and transcripts from the University of Bombay be submitted *in a sealed envelope* addressed directly to this office, however it was not received this way. Further, we note that the unusual text stated directly below the field of study on

The Form ETA 750 does not provide that the minimum academic requirements of four years of college culminating in a Bachelor of Arts or foreign equivalent degree in Culinary Art[s] or related field might be met through experience, an unspecified combination of education and experience, multiple lesser degrees, diplomas or certificates, or some other formula other than that explicitly stated on the Form ETA 750. The copies of the newspaper advertisements provided with the petitioner's response to the RFE issued by this office, also fail to advise the DOL or any otherwise qualified U.S. workers that the educational requirements for the job may be met through a quantitatively lesser degree or defined equivalency. Thus, the alien does not qualify as a skilled worker as he does not meet the terms of the labor certification as explicitly expressed or as extrapolated from the evidence of its intent about those requirements during the labor certification process.

The beneficiary does not have a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree, and fails to meet the requirements of the labor certification, and, thus, does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3) of the Act.

Additionally, it is noted that the additional employment verification letters submitted to the record do not establish that he has two years of full-time experience as a chef. As noted in the AAO's RFE:

> The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(1) states in pertinent part:
>
> > Evidence relating to qualifying experience or training shall be in the form of letter(s) from current or former employer(s) or trainer(s) and shall include the name, address, and title of the writer, and a specific description of the duties performed by the alien or of the training received.
>
> The record contains four letters from [redacted] (executive chef, The [redacted] (personnel manger, [redacted] (manager, [redacted] (manager, [redacted], respectively. The letter from Mr. [redacted] dated March 23, 2001, fails to state whether the employment of

---

the diploma referring to the field of study specializing in Indian Moglai, Tandoori cuisine and Indian sweets. It raises a question as to the authenticity of the diploma and also raises a question as to why an Indian diploma would characterize food as *Indian* Moglai or *Indian* sweets. (Emphasis added.) Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988).

> the beneficiary as a Demi-chef-de-partie was full-time or part-time and fails to confirm whether this employment as a Demi-chef-de-partie lasted from September 1, 1994 until the date of the letter. letter also fails to document whether the beneficiary's employment was full-time or part-time. letter is illegible as to the specific job held by the beneficiary and fails to specify whether his employment was full-time or part-time. Further, as the job was as an assistant of some kind, it is not clear that the beneficiary was performing the duties of the proffered job of chef as described in the ETA 750. The letter from is similarly deficient. It does not specify whether the beneficiary's job was full-time or part-time and does not sufficiently describe the beneficiary's duties. For example, none of the letters verify that the beneficiary has knowledge of Lucknowi cuisine as specified in Item 15 of the ETA 750 or that he "planned menus."

In response to the AAO's RFE, the petitioner submitted a letter from , dated August 12, 2010, signed by stating that the beneficiary worked as "Commis-II" from June 1, 1992 to October 1993, as "Commis-I" from November 1, 1993 to August 31, 1995, and as "Demi Chef De Partie" from September 1, 1995 to September 30, 2001. This was accompanied by a letter that referred to the beneficiary's Indian salary during this period of time. Neither letter confirms part-time or full-time employment. A letter, dated August 11, 2010 from of the , states that the beneficiary worked as an Indian cook from December 1989 to May 1992. This letter failed to describe the duties of this job so that it would be considered to qualify as experience in the proffered position of chef with the corresponding duties as stated on the ETA 750 and the letter failed to confirm whether this job was part-time or full-time. None of these letters discuss menu planning as well.

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 299 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)(*de novo* authority well recognized in federal courts).

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. 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.

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 not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.