

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
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B5

FILE: [REDACTED]
LIN 07 073 52391

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date NOV 27 2009

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.

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

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner claims to be a non-profit religious/charity organization. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a reporter. On the petition, the petitioner requested classification of the beneficiary as an advanced degree professional pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2). As required by 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(4), the petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL).

Section 203(b)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2), provides immigrant classification to members of the professions holding advanced degrees.¹ In order to obtain classification in this employment-based preference category, the labor certification must require a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(4).

The director denied the petition on December 10, 2007, because the labor certification did not require a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. The petitioner filed a motion to reconsider the decision on January 14, 2008. The director denied the motion to reopen on March 18, 2008. The petitioner appealed the denial of the motion to reopen on April 21, 2008. On appeal, counsel claims that the petitioner intended to request classification of the beneficiary as a professional pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act. Counsel claims that the petitioner's request to classify the beneficiary as an advanced degree professional was a "typographical error." Counsel now requests approval of the petition in the third preference professional category instead of the second preference advanced degree professional category.

A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm. 1988). In this case, the appropriate remedy would be for the petitioner to file a new petition on behalf of the beneficiary with the proper fee and required documentation.

The evidence submitted does not establish that the labor certification requires a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, and the appeal must therefore be dismissed.

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.

¹There is no evidence in the record of proceeding that the beneficiary possesses exceptional ability in the sciences, arts or business. Accordingly, consideration of the petition will be limited to whether the beneficiary is eligible for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.