

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: **OCT 18 2012** Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER FILE:

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 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, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a computer consulting company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a quality analyst III. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the beneficiary did not satisfy the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification. The director denied the petition accordingly.

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.

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.

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.*

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."

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) must examine "the language of the labor certification job requirements" in order to determine what the job requires. *Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008, 1015 (D.C. Cir. 1983). 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. See *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 alien employment certification application form. See *id.* at 834.

The instant Form I-140 was filed on September 30, 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 required education, training, experience, and special requirements for the offered position are set forth at Part H of the ETA Form 9089. Here, Part H shows that the position requires a master's degree, or foreign educational equivalent, in computer science, computer applications, engineering, technology, chemistry, math, physics, business, or a quantitative field. Alternatively, the petitioner will accept an "other" educational credential described as a bachelor's degree "via combination of education, Certificates, Training" and five years of experience. This alternative requirement would allow a beneficiary to qualify with less than a U.S. bachelor's degree or a foreign degree equivalent.

On appeal, counsel requested to change the instant petition to that of a skilled worker or professional. A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm'r 1988).

Since the minimum requirements, as stated on the ETA Form 9089, do not require the beneficiary to have at least a bachelor's degree and 5 years of experience, the petitioner has not established that the ETA Form 9089 requires a professional holding an advanced degree; and the appeal must be dismissed.¹ The merits of the appeal need not be addressed specifically because the appeal cannot be sustained for this threshold reason.

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.

¹ Even if the AAO considered the merits of the appeal, the AAO would have dismissed the appeal because the beneficiary's three-year Indian bachelor's degree plus post-graduate diploma has not been established to be the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree. Therefore, the beneficiary would not meet the terms of the ETA Form 9089 or the requirements of the advanced degree professional category.