

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

[REDACTED]

B5

DATE: **JUL 16 2012** OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

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:
[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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to 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 employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a pediatric hospital. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a pharmacist pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2). The petition is accompanied by ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, certified by the United States Department of Labor (DOL).

The director determined that the ETA Form 9089 failed to demonstrate that the job requires a professional holding an advanced degree or the equivalent of an alien of exceptional ability and, therefore, the beneficiary cannot be found qualified for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree or an alien of exceptional ability. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(4). The director denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the minimum educational qualification for the job is an advanced degree, i.e., doctor of pharmacy (Pharm. D.), even though the petitioner indicated on the ETA Form 9089 that a bachelor's degree would be acceptable. Counsel argues that, even though the petitioner has chosen to "maintain its openness to applications from older licensed [p]harmacists who may have only the Bachelor's in Pharmacy," the petitioner "prefers" the Pharm. D. degree, and no pharmacists holding only a bachelor's degree applied for the position during the recruitment process.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and timely. 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.

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.*

Section 203(b)(2) of the Act also includes aliens "who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States." The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2) defines "exceptional ability" as "a degree of expertise significantly above that ordinarily encountered."

Here, the Form I-140 was filed on May 6, 2010. On Part 2.d. of the Form I-140, the petitioner indicated that it was filing the petition for a member of the professions holding an advanced degree or an alien of exceptional ability.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(4) states in pertinent part that "[t]he job offer portion of an individual labor certification, Schedule A application, or Pilot Program application must demonstrate that the job requires a professional holding an advanced degree or the equivalent of an alien of exceptional ability."

In this case, the job offer portion of the ETA Form 9089 indicates that the minimum level of education required for the position is "Pharm. D. preferred, or Bachelor's" in the field of pharmacy. The position does not require any work experience. Accordingly, the job offer portion of the ETA Form 9089 does not require a professional holding an advanced degree or the equivalent of an alien of exceptional ability. One can qualify for the job with only a bachelor's degree in pharmacy and no work experience. However, the petitioner requested classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree or an alien of exceptional ability. The fact that no one holding only a bachelor's degree applied for the job is not relevant to the analysis. Moreover, the petitioner adding this minimum requirement as a way of expressing "its openness to [accepting] applications from older licensed [p]harmacists who may have only the Bachelor's in Pharmacy" does not change the fact that this constitutes the minimum educational requirement, which is not an advanced degree.

Furthermore, the fact that the petitioner noted that it "prefers" the Pharm. D., and articulated this preference in its recruitment materials, does not change the minimum requirements as set forth on the labor certification. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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'r 1986). *See also Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981). The fact remains that the minimum educational requirement is a bachelor's degree with no work experience, regardless of what the petitioner prefers.¹

¹ Counsel's reliance on decisions made by the Board of Alien Labor Certification Appeals (BALCA) is not persuasive. First, USCIS is not bound by BALCA decisions. While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions of USCIS are binding on all its employees in the administration of the Act, BALCA decisions are not similarly binding. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a). Second, the BALCA decisions cited by counsel are inapposite. For example, counsel cites as support the decision in *East Tennessee State University*, 2010-PER-00038 (July 12, 2010). However, that decision does not stand for the principle that an employer expressed "preference" for a higher educational credential removes the lesser credential from the job requirements. To the contrary, BALCA concluded that the petitioner's expression of a preference for a degree higher than the minimally acceptable degree in its advertisements was improper because this would discourage otherwise qualified candidates from applying.

The evidence submitted does not establish that the ETA Form 9089 requires a professional holding an advanced degree or the equivalent of an alien of exceptional ability, and the appeal must 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.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.