

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

B6

FILE: [REDACTED]
LIN 06 170 52385

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: SEP 28 2009

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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:

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, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is an information technology business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a programmer analyst (software engineer). As required by statute, a Form ETA 750,¹ Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor (DOL), accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary satisfied the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification.

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 record contains the beneficiary's Bachelor of Commerce degree from the University of Delhi in India; a credentials evaluation dated May 15, 2006, from Indo US Technology & Educational Services, Inc.; the beneficiary's Certificate of Computing from Indira Ghandi National Open University in India issued in 1997; the beneficiary's transcripts and certificates from the Network-Centered Computing Curriculum at the National Institute of Information Technology (NIIT) in India; and the beneficiary's certificates in Microsoft Certified Professional and Microsoft Certified Professional Solution Developer. On appeal, with regard to the beneficiary's qualifying academic credentials, counsel submits a brief, a copy of the decision in *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. Nov. 30, 2006), and previously submitted evidence.

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)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), also provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's priority date. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing on June 9, 2004.² The Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140) was filed on May 19, 2006.

¹ After March 28, 2005, the correct form to apply for labor certification is the Form ETA 9089. *See* 69 Fed. Reg. 77325, 77326 (Dec. 27, 2004).

² If the petition is approved, the priority date is also used in conjunction with the Visa Bulletin issued by the Department of State to determine when a beneficiary can apply for adjustment of status or for an

The job qualifications for the certified position of software engineer are found on Form ETA 750 Part A. Regarding the minimum level of education and experience required for the proffered position in this matter, Part A of the labor certification reflects the following requirements:

Block 14:

Education (number of years)

Grade school	blank
High school	blank
College	x
College Degree Required	Bachelor or equivalent
Major Field of Study	Computer Science

Experience:

Job Offered	0
(or)	
Related Occupation	blank

Block 15:

Other Special Requirements blank

As set forth above, the proffered position requires a Bachelor's degree or equivalent in Computer Science.

On the Form ETA 750B, signed by the beneficiary, the beneficiary stated her education as follows: University of Delhi in India, June 1995 to July 1998, Bachelor of Commerce degree; and National Institute of Information Technology in India, October 1996 to July 1998, diploma.

In support of the beneficiary's educational qualifications, the record contains a copy of the beneficiary's diploma from University of Delhi. It indicates that the beneficiary was awarded a Bachelor of Commerce degree on March 1, 1999. The record also contains a copy of a credentials evaluation, dated May 15, 2006, from Indo US Technology & Educational Services, Inc. It concludes that the beneficiary's degree from the University of Delhi is a three-year degree. The evaluation further equates the beneficiary's education, plus her Certificate of Computing from Indira Gandhi National Open University, her Diploma in Network-Centered Computing Curriculum from

immigrant visa abroad. Thus, the importance of reviewing the *bona fides* of a job opportunity as of the priority date is clear.

NIIT and her Microsoft Certificates, to a Bachelor's degree in Computer Information Systems from an accredited college or university in the United States.³

The director denied the petition on March 8, 2007. He determined that the beneficiary's three-year bachelor of commerce degree could not be accepted as a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. bachelor's degree in computer science because the beneficiary does not have a four-year bachelor's degree.

Part A of the ETA 750 indicates that the DOL assigned the occupational code of 030.062-010 and title software engineer, to the proffered position. DOL's occupational codes are assigned based on normalized occupational standards. According to DOL's public online database at <http://online.onetcenter.org/crosswalk/DOT?s=030.062-010&g=Go> (accessed August 26, 2009) and its description of the position and requirements for the position most analogous to the petitioner's proffered position, the position falls within Job Zone Four.

According to DOL, two to four years of work-related skill, knowledge, or experience are needed for Job Zone 4 occupations. DOL assigns a standard vocational preparation (SVP) range of 7-8 to Job Zone 4 occupations, which means "[m]ost of these occupations require a four-year bachelor's degree, but some do not." See <http://online.onetcenter.org/link/summary/15-1031.00> (accessed August 26, 2009). Additionally, DOL states the following concerning the training and overall experience required for these occupations:

A minimum of two to four years of work-related skill, knowledge, or experience is needed for these occupations. For example, an accountant must complete four years of college and work for several years in accounting to be considered qualified. Employees in these occupations usually need several years of work-related experience, on-the-job training, and/or vocational training.

See *id.* Because of the requirements of the proffered position and DOL's standard occupational requirements, the proffered position is for a professional, but might also be considered under the skilled worker category.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) states the following:

³ U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. See *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791, 795 (Commr. 1988). USCIS, however, is ultimately responsible for making the final determination regarding an alien's eligibility for the benefit sought. *Id.* The submission of letters from experts supporting the petition is not presumptive evidence of eligibility; USCIS may evaluate the content of those letters as to whether they support the alien's eligibility. See *id.* at 795. USCIS may even give less weight to an opinion that is not corroborated, in accord with other information or is in any way questionable. *Id.* at 795; see also *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Commr. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Regl. Commr. 1972)).

If the petition is for a professional, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien holds a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and by evidence that the alien is a member of the professions. Evidence of a baccalaureate degree shall be in the form of an official college or university record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study. To show that the alien is a member of the professions, the petitioner must submit evidence that the minimum of a baccalaureate degree is required for entry into the occupation.

The above regulation uses a singular description of foreign equivalent degree. Thus, the plain meaning of the regulatory language concerning the professional classification sets forth the requirement that a beneficiary must produce one degree that is determined to be the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree in order to be qualified as a professional for third preference visa category purposes.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. 204(5)(1)(3)(ii)(B) states the following:

If the petition is for a skilled worker, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification, meets the requirements for Schedule A designation, or meets the requirements for the Labor Market Information Pilot Program occupation designation. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

The above regulation requires that the alien meet the requirements of the labor certification.

Because the petition's proffered position qualifies for consideration under both the professional and skilled worker categories, the AAO will apply the regulatory requirements from both provisions to the facts of the case at hand, beginning with the professional category.

Initially, however, we will provide an explanation of the general process of procuring an employment-based immigrant visa and the roles and respective authority of both agencies involved.

As noted above, the Form ETA 750 in this matter is certified by DOL. Thus, at the outset, it is useful to discuss DOL's role in this process. Section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act provides:

In general.-Any alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor is inadmissible, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General that-

- (I) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified (or equally qualified in the case of an alien described in clause (ii)) and available

at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and

(II) the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to DOL, or the remaining regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether the position and the alien are qualified for a specific immigrant classification. This fact has not gone unnoticed by Federal Circuit Courts.

There is no doubt that the authority to make preference classification decisions rests with INS. The language of section 204 cannot be read otherwise. See *Castaneda-Gonzalez v. INS*, 564 F.2d 417, 429 (D.C. Cir. 1977). In turn, DOL has the authority to make the two determinations listed in section 212(a)(14).⁴ *Id.* at 423. The necessary result of these two grants of authority is that section 212(a)(14) determinations are not subject to review by INS absent fraud or willful misrepresentation, but all matters relating to preference classification eligibility not expressly delegated to DOL remain within INS' authority.

* * *

Given the language of the Act, the totality of the legislative history, and the agencies' own interpretations of their duties under the Act, we must conclude that Congress did not intend DOL to have primary authority to make any determinations other than the two stated in section 212(a)(14). If DOL is to analyze alien qualifications, it is for the purpose of "matching" them with those of corresponding United States workers so that it will then be "in a position to meet the requirement of the law," namely the section 212(a)(14) determinations.

Madany v. Smith, 696 F.2d 1008, 1012-1013 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

Relying in part on *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008, the Ninth circuit stated:

[I]t appears that the DOL is responsible only for determining the availability of suitable American workers for a job and the impact of alien employment upon the domestic labor market. It does not appear that the DOL's role extends to determining if the alien is qualified for the job for which he seeks sixth preference status. That determination appears to be delegated to the INS under section 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), as one of the determinations incident to the INS's decision whether the alien is entitled to sixth preference status.

⁴ Based on revisions to the Act, the current citation is section 212(a)(5)(A) as set forth above.

K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1983). The court relied on an amicus brief from DOL that stated the following:

The labor certification made by the Secretary of Labor ... pursuant to section 212(a)(14) of the ... [Act] ... is binding as to the findings of whether there are able, willing, qualified, and available United States workers for the job offered to the alien, and whether employment of the alien under the terms set by the employer would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed United States workers. *The labor certification in no way indicates that the alien offered the certified job opportunity is qualified (or not qualified) to perform the duties of that job.*

(Emphasis added.) *Id.* at 1009. The Ninth Circuit, citing *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006, revisited this issue, stating:

The Department of Labor (“DOL”) must certify that insufficient domestic workers are available to perform the job and that the alien’s performance of the job will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed domestic workers. *Id.* § 212(a)(14), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(14). The INS then makes its own determination of the alien’s entitlement to sixth preference status. *Id.* § 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). See generally *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 9th Cir.1983).

The INS, therefore, may make a de novo determination of whether the alien is in fact qualified to fill the certified job offer.

Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman, 736 F. 2d 1305, 1309 (9th Cir. 1984).

Therefore, it is DOL’s responsibility to certify the terms of the labor certification, but it is the responsibility of USCIS to determine if the petition and the alien beneficiary are eligible for the classification sought. For classification as a member of the professions, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) requires that the alien had a U.S. baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and be a member of the professions. Additionally, the regulation requires the submission of “an official *college or university* record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study.” (Emphasis added.)

In 1991, when the final rule for 8 C.F.R. § 204.5 was published in the Federal Register, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (the Service), responded to criticism that the regulation required an alien to have a bachelor’s degree as a minimum and that the regulation did not allow for the substitution of experience for education. After reviewing section 121 of the Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-649 (1990), and the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference, the Service specifically noted that both the Act and the legislative history indicate that an alien must have at least a bachelor’s degree: “[B]oth the Act and its legislative history make clear that, in order

to qualify as a professional under the third classification or to have experience equating to an advanced degree under the second, *an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree.*" 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60900 (November 29, 1991)(emphasis added).

Moreover, it is significant that both the statute, section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, and relevant regulations use the word "degree" in relation to professionals. A statute should be construed under the assumption that Congress intended it to have purpose and meaningful effect. *Mountain States Tel. & Tel. v. Pueblo of Santa Ana*, 472 U.S. 237, 249 (1985); *Sutton v. United States*, 819 F.2d. 1289m 1295 (5th Cir. 1987). It can be presumed that Congress' narrow requirement in of a "degree" for members of the professions is deliberate. Significantly, in another context, Congress has broadly referenced "the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning." Section 203(b)(2)(C) (relating to aliens of exceptional ability). Thus, the requirement at section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) that an eligible alien both have a baccalaureate "degree" and be a member of the professions reveals that a member of the professions must have a *degree* and that a diploma or certificate from an institution of learning other than a college or university is a potentially similar but distinct type of credential. Thus, even if we did not require "a" degree that is the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree, we would not consider education earned at an institution other than a college or university.

The petitioner in this matter relies on the beneficiary's three-year bachelor's degree, plus her Certificate of Computing from Indira Ghandi National Open University, her Diploma in Network-Centered Computing Curriculum from NIIT and her Microsoft Certificates, to reach the "equivalent" of a degree, which is not a bachelor's degree based on a single degree in the required field listed on the certified labor certification.

There is no provision in the statute or the regulations that would allow a beneficiary to qualify under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act with anything less than a full baccalaureate degree. More specifically, a three-year bachelor's degree will not be considered to be the "foreign equivalent degree" to a United States baccalaureate degree. A United States baccalaureate degree is generally found to require four years of education. *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. 244 (Reg. Comm. 1977). Where the analysis of the beneficiary's credentials relies on work experience alone or a combination of multiple lesser degrees, the result is the "equivalent" of a bachelor's degree rather than a single-source "foreign equivalent degree." In order to have experience and education equating to a bachelor's degree under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, the beneficiary must have a single degree that is the "foreign equivalent degree" to a United States baccalaureate degree.

Because the beneficiary does not have a "United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree," from a college or university in the required field of study listed on the certified labor certification, the beneficiary does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act as she does not have the minimum level of education required for the equivalent of a bachelor's degree.

We are cognizant of the recent decision in *Grace Korean United Methodist Church v. Michael Chertoff*, 437 F. Supp. 2d 1174 (D. Or. 2005), which finds that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration

Services (USCIS) “does not have the authority or expertise to impose its strained definition of ‘B.A. or equivalent’ on that term as set forth in the labor certification.” In contrast to the broad precedential authority of the case law of a United States circuit court, the AAO is not bound to follow the published decision of a United States district court in matters arising within the same district. *See Matter of K-S-*, 20 I&N Dec. 715 (BIA 1993). Although the reasoning underlying a district judge’s decision will be given due consideration when it is properly before the AAO, the analysis does not have to be followed as a matter of law. *Id.* at 719. The court in *Grace Korean* makes no attempt to distinguish its holding from the Circuit Court decisions cited above. Instead, as legal support for its determination, the court cited to a case holding that the United States Postal Service has no expertise or special competence in immigration matters. *Grace Korean United Methodist Church*, 437 F. Supp. 2d at 1179 (citing *Tovar v. U.S. Postal Service*, 3 F.3d 1271, 1276 (9th Cir. 1993)). On its face, *Tovar* is easily distinguishable from the present matter since USCIS, through the authority delegated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, is charged by statute with the enforcement of the United States immigration laws and not with the delivery of mail. *See* section 103(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a).

Additionally, we also note the recent decision in *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. Nov. 30, 2006). In that case, the labor certification application specified an educational requirement of four years of college and a ‘B.S. or foreign equivalent.’ The district court determined that ‘B.S. or foreign equivalent’ relates solely to the alien’s educational background, precluding consideration of the alien’s combined education and work experience. *Snapnames.com, Inc.* at *11-13. Additionally, the court determined that the word ‘equivalent’ in the employer’s educational requirements was ambiguous and that in the context of skilled worker petitions (where there is no statutory educational requirement), deference must be given to the employer’s intent. *Snapnames.com, Inc.* at *14. However, in professional and advanced degree professional cases, where the beneficiary is statutorily required to hold a baccalaureate degree, the USCIS properly concluded that a single foreign degree or its equivalent is required. *Snapnames.com, Inc.* at *17, 19.

Where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by professional regulation, USCIS must examine “the language of the labor certification job requirements” in order to determine what the petitioner must demonstrate about the beneficiary’s qualifications. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. 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.” *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 [labor certification application form].” *Id.* at 834 (emphasis added). USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that DOL has formally issued or otherwise attempt to divine the employer’s intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

Further, the employer's subjective intent may not be dispositive of the meaning of the actual minimum requirements of the proffered position. *Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act. No. 06-2158, 14 n. 7. Thus, USCIS agrees that the best evidence of the petitioner's intent concerning the actual minimum educational requirements of the proffered position is evidence of how it expressed those requirements to DOL during the labor certification process and not afterwards to USCIS. The timing of such evidence is needed to ensure inflation of those requirements is not occurring in an effort to fit the beneficiary's credentials into requirements that do not seem on their face to include what the beneficiary has.

Thus, the AAO issued a request for evidence (RFE) on May 6, 2009, soliciting such evidence. The petitioner failed to submit a response to the RFE. The petitioner's failure to submit the requested evidence cannot be excused. The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

To determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for a preference immigrant visa, USCIS must ascertain whether the alien is, in fact, qualified for the certified job. USCIS will not accept a degree equivalency or an unrelated degree when a labor certification plainly and expressly requires a candidate with a specific degree. In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. 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. 1986). *See also, Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008; *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006; *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

As advised in the RFE issued to the petitioner by this office, we have reviewed the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO).⁵ According to its website, www.aacrao.org, is "a nonprofit, voluntary, professional association of more than 10,000 higher education admissions and registration professionals who represent approximately 2,500 institutions in more than 30 countries." Its mission "is to provide professional development, guidelines and voluntary standards to be used by higher education officials regarding the best practices in records management, admissions, enrollment management, administrative information technology and student services." According to the registration page for EDGE, <http://aacraoedge.aacrao.org/register/index/php>, EDGE is "a web-based resource for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials." Authors for EDGE are not merely expressing their personal opinions. Rather, they must work with a publication consultant and a Council Liaison with AACRAO's National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials. "An Author's Guide to Creating AACRAO International Publications" 5-6 (First ed. 2005), available for download at www.aacrao.org/publications/guide_to_creating_international_publications.pdf. If placement recommendations are included, the Council Liaison works with the

⁵ In *Confluence Intern., Inc. v. Holder*, 2009 WL 825793 (D.Minn. March 27, 2009), the District Court in Minnesota determined that the AAO provided a rational explanation for its reliance on information provided by the American Association of Collegiate Registrar and Admissions Officers to support its decision.

author to give feedback and the publication is subject to final review by the entire Council. *Id.* at 11-12.

EDGE states that a bachelor of commerce degree in India “represents attainment of a level of education comparable to two to three years of university study in the United States.” *See* <http://aacraoedge.aacrao.org/credentialsAdvice.php?countryId=99&credentialID=128> (accessed August 26, 2009).

EDGE also discusses both Post Secondary Diplomas,⁶ for which the entrance requirement is completion of secondary education, and Postgraduate Diplomas (PGD), for which the entrance requirement is completion of a two- or three-year baccalaureate program. EDGE provides that a Post Secondary Diploma is comparable to one year of university study in the United States but does not suggest that, if combined with a three-year degree, may be deemed a foreign equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate degree. EDGE further asserts that a Postgraduate Diploma following a three-year bachelor’s degree “represents attainment of a level of education comparable to a bachelor’s degree in the United States.” *See* <http://aacraoedge.aacrao.org/credentialsAdvice.php?countryId=99&credentialID=131> (accessed March 10, 2009). The “Advice to Author Notes,” however, provide:

Postgraduate Diplomas should be issued by an accredited university or an institution approved by the All-India Council for Technical Education (AICTE). Some students complete PGDs over two years on a part-time basis. When examining the Postgraduate Diploma, note the entrance requirement and be careful not to confuse the PGD awarded after the Higher Secondary Certificate with the PGD awarded after the three-year bachelor’s degree.

Id.

The RFE requested the petitioner to provide evidence regarding the prerequisites for entry into the Certificate of Computing program at Indira Gandhi National Open University and the Network-Centered Computing Curriculum at NIIT,⁷ and evidence that the institutions are accredited by AICTE.⁸ The petitioner failed to submit a response to the RFE. The failure to submit requested

⁶ <http://aacraoedge.aacrao.org/credentialsAdvice.php?countryId=99&credentialID=126> (accessed March 10, 2009).

⁷ The AAO notes that it appears that the beneficiary received her Certificate of Computing from Indira Gandhi National Open University prior to receiving her bachelor’s degree from the University of Delhi. It also appears that the beneficiary took courses in Network-Centered Computing Curriculum at NIIT prior to receiving her bachelor’s degree.

⁸ The RFE also requested the beneficiary’s transcripts from the University of Delhi and the beneficiary’s diploma from NIIT.

evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

The Form ETA 750 does not provide that the minimum academic requirement of a Bachelor's degree or equivalent in Computer Science might be met through a combination of lesser degrees, certificates and/or diplomas or some other formula other than that explicitly stated on the Form ETA 750. The petitioner has not demonstrated that it advised DOL or any otherwise qualified U.S. workers that the educational requirements for the job may be met through a quantitatively lesser degree or defined equivalency. Thus, the alien does not qualify as a skilled worker as she does not meet the terms of the labor certification.

The beneficiary does not have a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree, and fails to meet the requirements of the labor certification, and, thus, does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3) of the Act.

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.