

**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:



Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date:


LIN 07 026 51382

JAN 15 2010

IN RE:

Petitioner:

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:



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).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner, a nursing facility, seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a registered nurse. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a professional or skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A).¹

The petitioner has applied for the beneficiary under a blanket labor certification pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.5, Schedule A, Group I. *See also* 20 C.F.R. § 656.15. Schedule A is the list of occupations set forth at 20 C.F.R. § 656.5 with respect to which the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) has determined that there are not sufficient United States workers who are able, willing, qualified and available, and that the employment of aliens in such occupations will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of United States workers similarly employed.

Based on 8 C.F.R. §§ 204.5(a)(2) and (l)(3)(i) an applicant for a Schedule A position would file Form I-140, "accompanied by any required individual labor certification, application for Schedule A designation, or evidence that the alien's occupation qualifies as a shortage occupation within the Department of Labor's Labor Market Information Pilot Program." The priority date of any petition filed for classification under section 203(b) of the Act "shall be the date the completed, signed petition (including all initial evidence and the correct fee) is properly filed with [U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)]." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

Pursuant to the regulations set forth in Title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the filing must include evidence of prearranged employment for the alien beneficiary. The employment is evidenced by the employer's completion of the job offer description on the application form and evidence that the employer has provided appropriate notice of filing the Application for Permanent Employment Certification to the bargaining representative or to the employer's employees as set forth in 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d). Also, according to 20 C.F.R. § 656.15(c)(2), aliens who will be permanently employed as professional nurses must have (1) passed the Commission on Graduates of Foreign Nursing Schools (CGFNS) Examination, or (2) hold a full and unrestricted license to practice professional nursing in the [s]tate of intended employment, or (3) that the alien has passed the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN).

The director denied the instant petition because the petitioner failed to submit a valid prevailing wage determination (PWD) in accordance with 20 C.F.R. § 656.40.

¹Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), grants preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable 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 grants preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

The AAO reviews issues raised in the denial of this petition *de novo*. See *Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989) (noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.²

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

A petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing. See *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm. 1971). 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).

The director's decision states that the petitioner failed to submit a PWD from the relevant State Workforce Agency (SWA) in compliance with 20 C.F.R. § 656.40. The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.40 specifically sets forth that the petitioner must request a wage and the wage obtained is assigned a validity period. In order to use a PWD, "employers must file their [Schedule A] applications . . . within the validity period specified by the SWA." See 20 C.F.R. § 656.40(c). The petitioner must file ETA Form 9089 and Form I-140 with the PWD issued by the SWA having jurisdiction over the proposed area of employment. See 20 C.F.R. § 656.15(b)(1).

The instant petition was filed on October 17, 2006. There are two PWDs in the record of proceeding. The first PWD, dated September 20, 2006, states that it is valid until July 1, 2006.³ However, this PWD was filed for a different company at a different address for a different alien by a different attorney for a position with a different proffered wage. The second PWD, dated November 13, 2006 (after the petition was filed), states that it is valid through June 30, 2007. Accordingly, neither PWD submitted by the petitioner was valid at the time the petition was filed with USCIS.

In summary, the record does not contain a PWD that complies with the regulatory requirements set forth at 20 C.F.R. § 656.40.

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.

²The 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). See *Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

³It appears that the SWA made a typographical error on the first PWD. It appears that the PWD should have been valid until July 1, 2007. However, it is incumbent upon the petitioner obtain a PWD from the SWA with correct validity dates.