identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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

PUBLIC COPY

[redacted]

B6

FILE: [redacted] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 0 8 2009

LIN 07 002 51958

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

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).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference 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 home health agency. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a home health aide. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL).[1] The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the petition requires at least two years of training or experience and, therefore, that the beneficiary cannot be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. 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.

As set forth in the director's July 18, 2007 denial, the single issue in this case is whether or not the petitioner has established that the petition requires at least two years of training or experience such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii), provides for the granting of preference classification to other qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

Here, the Form I-140 was filed on September 29, 2006. On Part 2.e. of the Form I-140, the petitioner indicated that it was filing the petition for a professional or a skilled worker.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's *de novo* authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence

---

[1] Part 14 of the Form ETA 750 indicates that the proffered position requires three months of experience in the offered job. There are no education or training requirements for the proffered position. Part 15 of the Form ETA 750 lists the following special requirement: "2 character references required." The petitioner failed to provide two character references for the beneficiary.

properly submitted upon appeal.[2] On appeal, counsel submits an experience letter for the beneficiary. On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner wishes to amend Part 2 of the Form I-140 to indicate that it is filing the petition for an unskilled worker.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. 204.5(i) provides in pertinent part:

> (4) Differentiating between skilled and other workers. The determination of whether a worker is a skilled or other worker will be based on the requirements of training and/or experience placed on the job by the prospective employer, as certified by the Department of Labor.

In this case, Part 14 of the Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, indicates that the proffered position requires three months of experience in the offered job. However, the petitioner requested the skilled worker classification on the Form I-140. There is no provision in statute or regulation that compels United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to readjudicate a petition under a different visa classification in response to a petitioner's request to change it, once the decision has been rendered. A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm. 1988). In this matter, the appropriate remedy would be to file another petition with the proper fee and required documentation.

The evidence submitted does not establish that the petition requires at least two years of training or experience such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker.

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.

---

[2] The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).