

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

B5

Date: **JUN 19 2012** Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

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:

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 with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a 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 Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed this denial to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), and, on July 13, 2010, the AAO dismissed the appeal. Counsel filed a motion to reopen (MTR) the AAO's decision in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. The motion will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an information technology company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a software engineer. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (the DOL). The director determined that the beneficiary did not satisfy the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification and that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. The director denied the petition accordingly. The AAO affirmed this determination on appeal.

In pertinent part, section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2), 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.*

In dismissing the appeal, the AAO noted that the beneficiary did not satisfy the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification and the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition.

On motion, counsel states "that the [U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)] should adjudicate this case based on guidance" detailed in the "2003 USCIS memo from [REDACTED] Director of Business and Trade Services."

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) states in pertinent part:

*Requirements for motion to reopen.* A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be provided in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. . . .

Within the July 2003 letter, Mr. [REDACTED] states that he believes that the combination of a post-graduate diploma and a three-year baccalaureate degree may be considered to be the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree.

At the outset, it is noted that private discussions and correspondence solicited to obtain advice from

USCIS are not binding on the AAO or other USCIS adjudicators and do not have the force of law. *Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N 169, 196-197 (Comm'r 1968); *see also*, Memorandum from ██████████ Acting Associate Commissioner, Office of Programs, U.S. Immigration & Naturalization Service, *Significance of Letters Drafted By the Office of Adjudications* (December 7, 2000).

Moreover, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(i)(B) is clear in allowing only for the equivalency of one foreign degree to a United States baccalaureate, not a combination of degrees, diplomas or employment experience. Additionally, although 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2), as referenced by counsel and in Mr. ██████████ correspondence, permits a certain combination of progressive work experience and a bachelor's degree to be considered the equivalent of an advanced degree, there is no comparable provision to substitute a combination of degrees, work experience, or certificates which, when taken together, equals the same amount of coursework required for a U.S. baccalaureate degree. We do not find the determination of the credentials evaluation probative in this matter. It is further noted that a bachelor's degree is generally found to require four years of education. *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. 244 (Comm'r 1977). In that case, the Regional Commissioner declined to consider a three-year Bachelor of Science degree from India as the equivalent of a United States baccalaureate degree because the degree did not require four years of study. *Id.* at 245.

Based on the plain meaning of "new," a new fact is found to be evidence that was not available and could not have been discovered or presented in the previous proceeding.<sup>1</sup>

The motion contains no facts that could be considered "new" under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). Therefore, the motion does not meet the applicable requirements of motions to reopen.

Motions for the reopening of immigration proceedings are disfavored for the same reasons as petitions for rehearing and motions for a new trial on the basis of newly discovered evidence. *INS v. Doherty*, 502 U.S. 314, 323 (1992)(citing *INS v. Abudu*, 485 U.S. 94 (1988)). A party seeking to reopen a proceeding bears a "heavy burden." *INS v. Abudu*, 485 U.S. at 110.

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 sustained that burden. Accordingly, the motion will be dismissed, the proceedings will not be reopened, and the previous decisions of the director and the AAO will not be disturbed.

**ORDER:** The motion is dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The word "new" is defined as "1. having existed or been made for only a short time . . . 3. Just discovered, found, or learned <new evidence> . . . ." WEBSTER'S NEW RIVERSIDE UNIVERSITY DICTIONARY 792 (1984) (emphasis in original).