


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  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



Be

DATE: OCT 03 2011 OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE:




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:

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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must 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 Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner describes itself as a construction company. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as an electrician. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a 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).<sup>1</sup>

The petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The priority date of the petition is December 21, 2007, which is the date the labor certification was accepted for processing by the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

The director denied the petition on May 22, 2008. The director's decision concludes that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary possessed the experience required to perform the offered position as set forth in the labor certification.

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.

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 petitioner must establish that the beneficiary possessed all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the priority date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); *see also Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971). 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. United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Matter of*

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of 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.

<sup>2</sup> The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, which are incorporated into the regulations by 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).

*Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant*, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm. 1986). See also, *Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coorney*, 661 F.2d 1 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1981).

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). 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].” *Id.* at 834.

Even though the labor certification may be prepared with the alien in mind, USCIS has an independent role in determining whether the alien meets the labor certification requirements. *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. Nov. 30, 2006). Thus, where the plain language of those requirements does not support the petitioner’s asserted intent, USCIS “does not err in applying the requirements as written.” *Id.* at \*7.

The required education, training, experience and skills for the offered position are set forth at Part H of the labor certification. In the instant case, the labor certification states that the position requires 24 months of experience in the offered position.

Part J of the labor certification states that the beneficiary did not gain any qualifying experience with the petitioner in a position “substantially comparable” to the offered position, and also that the beneficiary was not employed by the petitioner at the time of filing, December 21, 2006.

Part K of the labor certification states that the beneficiary worked as an electrician for [REDACTED] Inc., in [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] and as an “[REDACTED] [REDACTED]” [REDACTED]. The labor certification does not list any other experience.

The record of proceeding contains the following evidence of the beneficiary’s experience:

- An employment letter from [REDACTED] stating that the beneficiary worked there as an electrician from [REDACTED]
- An employment letter from [REDACTED] stating that the beneficiary worked for his company full-time from [REDACTED] performing “electrical trade functions.”
- A letter from [REDACTED] the petitioner, stating that the beneficiary had worked for his company from [REDACTED]

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3) provides, in part:

(ii) *Other documentation*—

(A) *General.* Any requirements of training or experience for skilled workers, professionals, or other workers must be supported by letters from trainers or employers giving the name, address, and title of the trainer or employer, and a description of the training received or the experience of the alien.

(B) *Skilled workers.* 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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g) also states that evidence relating to qualifying experience shall be in the form of letters from current or former employers and shall include the name, address, and title of the writer, and a specific description of the duties performed by the alien. If such evidence is unavailable, other documentation relating to the alien's experience or training will be considered. *Id.*

There are multiple contradictions and omissions in the record of proceeding relating to the beneficiary's employment experience:

- The labor certification states that the beneficiary worked for [REDACTED]. However, the employment letter from the company states that the beneficiary worked there for only 4 ½ months, from [REDACTED].
- The labor certification states that the beneficiary had worked for [REDACTED] until the filing date. However, the record contains an employment letter stating that the beneficiary had worked for the petitioner during an overlapping period, from [REDACTED].
- The record does not contain an employment experience letter from Dahan Electric.
- The labor certification does not mention the claimed employment with the petitioner or Gama Plus SRL.
- The petitioner's experience letter states that the beneficiary worked for the company for 26 months. However, the labor certification states at Part J.21 that the beneficiary did not gain any qualifying experience with the petitioner in a position substantially comparable to the offered position.

It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of

course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Id.* at 591. *See also, Matter of Leung*, 16 I&N Dec. 2530 (BIA 1976)(claimed qualifying experience is less credible if it is not listed on the labor certification).

On appeal, counsel asserts that the submitted employment letters satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. Counsel does not submit any independent objective evidence resolving the discrepancies or explaining the contradictions in the record. Therefore, the AAO affirms the director's decision that the submitted evidence does not establish that the beneficiary possessed 24 months of experience in the offered position as of the priority date. Thus, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary possesses the experience required to perform the proffered position. 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)).

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.