

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  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

B6



FILE:



Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

SEP 22 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 operates a hospital/healthcare institution and seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a registered nurse, a skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2), and 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. *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii).

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 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."<sup>1</sup> 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). Here, the petitioner filed the I-140 petition on August 10, 2007.

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 Alien Employment Certification to the bargaining representative or to the employer's employees as set forth in 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d).

---

<sup>1</sup> On March 28, 2005, pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.17, the Application for Permanent Employment Certification, ETA 9089 replaced the Application for Alien Employment Certification, Form ETA 750. The new Form ETA 9089 was introduced in connection with the re-engineered permanent foreign labor certification program (PERM), which was published in the Federal Register on December 27, 2004 with an effective date of March 28, 2005. *See* 69 Fed. Reg. 77326 (Dec. 27, 2004).

On April 8, 2009, the director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to properly post the position in accordance with 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d)(1). Specifically, the director found that the petitioner failed to include information stating that the notice was being posted because the petitioner had filed an application for permanent alien labor certification. The director also found that the petitioner did not list the dates of posting, the petitioner did not demonstrate that it had posted the notice between 30 and 180 days before filing the petition, the petitioner did not obtain a Prevailing Wage Determination (PWD), the petitioner did not document or evidence that it had published the notice in any in-house media, and the petitioner had not established its ability to pay the proffered wage. Thus, proper notice had not been given to prospective U.S. workers.

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.<sup>2</sup>

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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner had posted the notice for ten consecutive business days, which occurred between 30 and 180 days before filing the petition. Counsel has not listed the dates the notice was posted. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

Counsel states that the petitioner did not need to include information stating that the notice was being posted due to the fact that the petitioner had filed an application for permanent alien labor certification. Counsel did not address the issues that the petitioner did not obtain a certified PWD, that the petitioner did not document or evidence that it had published the notice in any in-house media, and that the petitioner had not established its ability to pay the proffered wage. With regard to these issues, counsel merely asserts that notice was posted in a conspicuous location within the petitioner's business.

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).

---

<sup>2</sup> The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) 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).

One of the requirements to meet Schedule A eligibility is that the petitioner is required to post the position in accordance with 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d), which provides:

- (1) In applications filed under § 656.15 (Schedule A), § 656.16 (Shepherders), § 656.17 (Basic Process); § 656.18 (College and University Teachers), and § 656.21 (Supervised Recruitment), the employer must give notice of the filing of the Application for Permanent Employment Certification and be able to document that notice was provided, if requested by the certifying officer as follows:

...

- (ii) If there is no such bargaining representative, by posted notice to the employer's employees at the facility or location of the employment. The notice must be posted for at least 10 consecutive business days. The notice must be clearly visible and unobstructed while posted and must be posted in conspicuous places where the employer's U.S. workers can readily read the posted notice on their way to or from their place of employment . . . In addition, the employer must publish the notice in any and all in-house media, whether electronic or printed, in accordance with the normal procedures used for the recruitment of similar positions in the employer's organization.

...

- (3) The notice of the filing of an Application for Permanent Employment Certification must:

- (i) State the notice is being provided as a result of the filing of an application for permanent alien labor certification for the relevant job opportunity;

- (ii) State any person may provide documentary evidence bearing on the application to the Certifying Officer of the Department of Labor;

- (iii) Provide the address of the appropriate Certifying Officer; and (iv) Be provided between 30 and 180 days before filing the application.

...

- (6) If an application is filed under the Schedule A procedures . . . the notice must contain a description of the job and rate of pay, and must meet the requirements of this section.

Additionally, section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act states the following:

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 . . . that

- (I) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified . . . 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 U.S. similarly employed.

Fundamental to these provisions is the need to ensure that there are no qualified U.S. workers available for the position prior to filing. The required posting notice seeks to allow any person with evidence related to the application to notify the appropriate DOL officer prior to petition filing. *See* the Immigration Act of 1990, Pub.L. No. 101-649, 122(b)(1), 1990 Stat. 358 (1990); *see also* Labor Certification Process for the Permanent Employment of Aliens in the United States and Implementation of the Immigration Act of 1990, 56 Fed. Reg. 32,244 (July 15, 1991).

The posting notice submitted with the petition was insufficient. It does not include required information stating that the notice was being posted because the petitioner had filed an application for permanent alien labor certification. The notice did not provide the address of the appropriate Certifying Officer as required by 20 C.F.R. § 656.20(d)(3)(iii). For employment in California, the proper address of the appropriate Certifying Officer<sup>3</sup> is:

United States Department of Labor  
Atlanta National Processing Center  
Harris Tower  
233 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 410  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

The posting notice also does not list the dates in which it was posted. Thus, it is not clear if it was posted for the requisite period of ten consecutive business days or not and if the posting was completed between 30 and 180 days before filing the petition on August 10, 2007 or not.

The AAO notes that the PWD submitted with the petition was not certified by the state of California. Thus, it was not valid. For Schedule A applications, the PWD must be valid when the petition and accompanying ETA Form 9089 are filed with USCIS. Though counsel asserts that the petitioner posted the notice in a conspicuous location within the petitioner's business, there is no evidence that the petitioner had published the notice in any in-house media.

---

<sup>3</sup> *See* <http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/contacts.cfm#CA> (accessed August 25, 2010).

Thus, the AAO finds that the petitioner did not give proper notice of the areas of intended employment.

Based on the foregoing, the posting notice remains deficient and is not in compliance with 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d). Therefore, the basis for denial has not been overcome.

Furthermore, the petitioner has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage.

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.