

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B5-



FILE: [redacted] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 16 2008
LIN 06 258 51809

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary: [redacted]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska 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 a software development and consulting firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a project manager pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2). As required by statute, an ETA Form 9089 Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor (DOL), accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the beneficiary did not satisfy the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification. Specifically, the director determined that the beneficiary did not possess a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. baccalaureate.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director erred in presuming that the beneficiary's education was not equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate. The petitioner submits evaluations that only equate the beneficiary's three-year degree *in combination* with his postgraduate diplomas to the number of credits required for a baccalaureate in the United States. Finally, the petitioner submits an "article" by Dr. John Kersey and Dr. Sheila Danzig concluding that Indian three-year degrees by themselves are equivalent to U.S. bachelor degrees. This "article" is posted on the website of a degree evaluation site managed by Dr. Danzig.

In pertinent part, section 203(b)(2) of the Act provides immigrant classification to members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent and whose services are sought by an employer in the United States. An advanced degree is a United States academic or professional degree or a foreign equivalent degree above the baccalaureate level. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2). The regulation further states: "A United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree followed by at least five years of progressive experience in the specialty shall be considered the equivalent of a master's degree. If a doctoral degree is customarily required by the specialty, the alien must have a United States doctorate or a foreign equivalent degree." *Id.*

The beneficiary in this matter has a three-year Bachelor of Commerce from Osmania University and Postgraduate Diplomas in Computer Applications from Lan Eseda in 1993 and the Jawaharlal Nehru National Youth Centre (JNNYC) in 1995. The issue in this case is whether the petitioner has demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree.

As noted above, the ETA Form 9089 in this matter is certified by DOL. DOL's role is limited to determining whether there are sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified and available and whether the employment of the alien will adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed. Section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act; 20 C.F.R. § 656.1(a).

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to DOL, or the remaining regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether or not the alien is qualified for a specific immigrant classification or even the job offered. This fact has not gone

unnoticed by federal circuit courts. *See Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F. 2d 1305, 1309 (9th Cir. 1984); *Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008, 1012-1013 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

Initially, the petitioner submitted the beneficiary's second-division three-year Bachelor of Commerce degree from Osmania University. The petitioner also submitted the beneficiary's Postgraduate Diploma in Computer Applications from JNNYC and memorandum of marks from JNNYC listing an exam date of October 16, 1995. The petitioner did not submit an evaluation of this education. We note that the petitioner previously filed a Form I-140 petition in behalf of the beneficiary seeking a lesser classification pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Act, receipt number SRC-07-010-51773. In support of this petition, the petitioner submitted a Form ETA-750B signed by the beneficiary under penalty of perjury on August 17, 2001. On this form, the beneficiary indicated that his Bachelor of Commerce degree involved only "90 semester units." Moreover, while he listed his postgraduate diploma from Lan Eseda, he did not list any diploma from JNNYC. That said, that petition was accompanied by the beneficiary's Bachelor of Commerce degree and his postgraduate diplomas from Lan Eseda and JNNYC. We note that the JNNYC memorandum of marks submitted in support of this earlier petition lists the beneficiary's exam date as November 14, 1995.

On appeal, the petitioner resubmits the beneficiary's three-year Bachelor of Commerce degree, his postgraduate diplomas and the memorandum of marks from JNNYC with the November 14, 1995 exam date. The petitioner also submits three evaluations of the beneficiary's education. Dr. Richard Spillman of Universal Evaluations and Consulting, Inc. concludes that the beneficiary's Bachelor of Commerce coursework is "substantially similar to those required towards the completion of academic studies leading to three-year university-level credit from regionally accredited college or university in the United States." Dr. Spillman then equates the beneficiary's education *and experience* as equivalent to a U.S. Master's degree. Dr. Prem Gupta, an evaluator with E³S, considered the beneficiary's bachelor degree *and postgraduate diplomas* as "equivalent of four years of university-level credit from an accredited college or university in the United States." Finally, Dr. Bhushan Kapoor, an evaluator with California State, Fullerton, also equates the beneficiary's bachelor degree *and postgraduate diplomas* as "equivalent to an individual with a Bachelor's degree."

CIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. *See Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791, 795 (Commr. 1988). However, CIS is ultimately responsible for making the final determination regarding an alien's eligibility for the benefit sought. *Id.* The submission of letters from experts supporting the petition is not presumptive evidence of eligibility; CIS may evaluate the content of those letters as to whether they support the alien's eligibility. *See id.* at 795. CIS may even give less weight to an opinion that is not corroborated, in accord with other information or is in any way questionable. *Id.* at 795; *see also Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Commr. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Regl. Commr. 1972)).

The AAO is bound by the Act, agency regulations, and precedent decisions of the agency and published decisions from the circuit court of appeals from whatever circuit that the action arose. *See*

N.L.R.B. v. Ashkenazy Property Management Corp., 817 F.2d 74, 75 (9th Cir. 1987)(administrative agencies are not free to refuse to follow precedent in cases originating within the circuit); *R.L. Inv. Ltd. Partners v. INS*, 86 F. Supp. 2d 1014, 1022 (D. Haw. 2000), *aff'd* 273 F.3d 874 (9th Cir. 2001)(unpublished agency decisions and agency legal memoranda are not binding under the APA, even when they are published in private publications or widely circulated). Even CIS internal memoranda do not establish judicially enforceable rights. *See Loa-Herrera v. Trominski*, 231 F.3d 984, 989 (5th Cir. 2000)(An agency's internal guidelines "neither confer upon [plaintiffs] substantive rights nor provide procedures upon which [they] may rely.")

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). This decision involved a petition filed under 8 U.S.C. §1153(a)(3) as amended in 1976. At that time, this section provided:

Visas shall next be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions

The Act added section 203(b)(2)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §1153(b)(2)(A), which provides:

Visas shall be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent

Significantly, the statutory language used prior to *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. at 244 is identical to the statutory language used subsequent to that decision but for the requirement that the immigrant hold an advanced degree or its equivalent. The Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference, published as part of the House of Representatives Conference Report on the Act, provides that "[in] considering equivalency in category 2 advanced degrees, it is anticipated that the alien must have a bachelor's degree with at least five years progressive experience in the professions." H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 955, 101st Cong., 2nd Sess. 1990, 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 6784, 1990 WL 201613 at *6786 (October 26, 1990).

At the time of enactment of the Act in 1990, it had been almost thirteen years since *Matter of Shah* was issued. Congress is presumed to have intended a four-year degree when it stated that an alien "must have a bachelor's degree" when considering equivalency for second preference immigrant visas. We must assume that Congress was aware of the agency's previous treatment of a "bachelor's degree" under the Act when the new classification was enacted and did not intend to alter the agency's interpretation of that term. *See Lorillard v. Pons*, 434 U.S. 575, 580-81 (1978)(Congress is presumed to be aware of administrative and judicial interpretations where it adopts a new law incorporating sections of a prior law). *See also* 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60900 (Nov. 29, 1991) (an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree).

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:

The Act states that, in order to qualify under the second classification, alien members of the professions must hold "advanced degrees or their equivalent." As the legislative history . . . indicates, the equivalent of an advanced degree is "a bachelor's degree with at least five years progressive experience in the professions." Because neither the Act nor its legislative history indicates that bachelor's or advanced degrees must be United States degrees, the Service will recognize foreign equivalent degrees. But both 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 (Nov. 29, 1991)(emphasis added).

There is no provision in the statute or the regulations that would allow a beneficiary to qualify under section 203(b)(2) of the Act as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree 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 U.S. baccalaureate degree. *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. at 245. 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 "foreign equivalent degree."¹ In order to have experience and education equating to an advanced degree under section 203(b)(2) of the Act, the beneficiary must have a single degree that is the "foreign equivalent degree" to a United States baccalaureate degree. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2). As explained in the preamble to the final rule, persons who claim to qualify for an immigrant visa by virtue of education or experience equating to a bachelor's degree may qualify for a visa pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act as a skilled worker with more than two years of training and experience. 56 Fed. Reg. at 60900.

For this classification, advanced degree professional, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(i)(B) requires the submission of an "official academic record showing that the alien has a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree." For classification as a member of the professions, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) 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." We cannot conclude that the evidence required to demonstrate that an alien is an advanced degree professional is any less than the evidence required to show that the alien is a professional. To do so would undermine the Congressionally mandated classification scheme by allowing a lesser evidentiary standard for the more restrictive visa classification. Moreover, the

¹ Compare 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5)(defining for purposes of a nonimmigrant visa classification, the "equivalence to completion of a college degree" as including, in certain cases, a specific combination of education and experience). The regulations pertaining to the immigrant classification sought in this matter do not contain similar language.

commentary accompanying the proposed advanced degree professional regulation specifically states that a “baccalaureate means a bachelor’s degree received *from a college or university*, or an equivalent degree.” (Emphasis added.) 56 Fed. Reg. 30703, 30306 (July 5, 1991). Cf. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(ii)(A) (relating to aliens of exceptional ability requiring the submission of “an official academic record showing that the alien has a degree, *diploma, certificate or similar award* from a college, university, *school or other institution of learning* relating to the area of exceptional ability”).

The petitioner relies on the beneficiary’s postgraduate diplomas in addition to his three-year baccalaureate as equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate. As discussed above, the regulations clearly distinguish between “college or university” and “school or other institution of learning.” We interpret the terms “college” and “university” in the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) and the commentary at 56 Fed. Reg. at 30306 as including only those institutions that award at least a baccalaureate degree.² The record contains no evidence that Lan Eseda or JNNYC offer complete general studies baccalaureate programs as opposed to postgraduate technical education. Thus, neither is a college or university. As such, the postgraduate diplomas issued by these entities are not degrees issued by a college or university. Postgraduate diplomas that are not degrees issued by a college or university cannot be considered as evidence that the beneficiary has a “foreign equivalent degree” to a United States baccalaureate, even in combination with a three-year baccalaureate. Four years of education is not presumptive evidence of education equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate for purposes of this immigrant classification, especially when less than four years of that education was acquired at a college or university.

Because the beneficiary does not have a “United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree,” the beneficiary does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(2) of the Act as he does not have the minimum level of education required for the equivalent of an advanced degree.

Qualifications for the Job Offered

Relying in part on *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008, the U.S. Federal Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (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),

² This interpretation is consistent with the most relevant definition for the term “college” in Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary 259 (1990), “an independent institution of higher learning offering a course of general studies leading to a bachelor’s degree,” and the term “university” in the same publication at 1291, an institution of higher learning authorized “to grant academic degrees; *specif*: one made up of an undergraduate division which confers bachelor’s degrees and a graduate division which comprises a graduate school and professional schools each of which may confer master’s degrees and doctorates.”

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 DOL that stated the following:

The labor certification made by the Secretary of Labor ... pursuant to section 212(a)[(5)] 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 INS, therefore, may make a de novo determination of whether the alien is in fact qualified to fill the certified job offer.” *Tongatapu*, 736 F. 2d at 1309.

The key to determining the job qualifications is found on ETA Form 9089 Part H. This section of the application for alien labor certification, “Job Opportunity Information,” describes the terms and conditions of the job offered. It is important that the ETA Form 9089 be read as a whole.

When determining whether a beneficiary is eligible for a preference immigrant visa, CIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. CIS must examine “the language of the labor certification job requirements” in order to determine what the job requires. *Id.* The only rational manner by which CIS 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. *See Rosedale Linden Park Company v. Smith*, 595 F. Supp. 829, 833 (D.D.C. 1984)(emphasis added). CIS's interpretation of the job's requirements, as stated on the labor certification must involve reading and applying *the plain language* of the alien employment certification application form. *See id.* at 834. CIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that DOL has formally issued or otherwise attempt to divine the employer's intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

In this matter, Part H, line 4, of the labor certification reflects that a bachelor's degree in commerce is the minimum level of education required. Line 6 reflects that five years of experience are required. Line 7-A reflects that computer science and information systems are also acceptable major fields of study. Line 8 reflects that a combination of education or experience is acceptable in the alternative. That alternative is specified on lines 8-A through 8-C as a Master's degree plus no experience. Line 9 reflects that a foreign educational equivalent is acceptable.

As stated above, Line 9 allows the employer to indicate whether or not a foreign equivalent degree is acceptable. Thus, we must presume that lines 4, 7 and 8 all refer to U.S. degrees. Thus, the alien employment certificate indicates that the job requires a U.S. baccalaureate or foreign educational equivalent. As discussed above, the beneficiary does not have a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. baccalaureate. Even if we were to conclude that the beneficiary meets the job requirements set forth on the alien employment certification, we would then have to conclude that the job does not require an advanced degree professional as required under 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(4).

The beneficiary does not have a “United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree,” and, thus, does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(2) of the Act. In addition, the beneficiary does not meet the job requirements on the labor certification. For these reasons, considered both in sum and as separate grounds for denial, the petition may not be approved.

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.