


**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**



B6

DATE: **SEP 02 2011** OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

IN RE: Petitioner: 
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other, Unskilled Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 employment-based immigrant 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 summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a farm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an agricultural equipment operator. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification (labor certification), approved by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL).

The director denied the petition on April 13, 2010. The petitioner did not submit the required initial evidence with the petition. The director's decision concluded that the petitioner had therefore not established that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage or that the beneficiary met the experience requirement for the offered position set forth on the labor certification.

The petitioner appealed the decision on May 14, 2010. The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and timely. The appeal contains a Form I-290, Notice of Appeal or Motion, the petitioner's 2009 federal income tax return, and a 2009 Form W-2, Wage and Tax Statement, issued by the petitioner to the beneficiary.

On Part 3 of Form I-290B, the space allotted to identify any erroneous conclusions of law or fact in the decision, was left blank. To date, no brief in support of the appeal has been submitted to the AAO.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. The petitioner has not specifically addressed any erroneous conclusions of law or statements of fact. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

Even if the appeal were not summarily dismissed, the decision would have been dismissed on the merits.

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. 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 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. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st 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 three months of experience in the offered position.

The petitioner must document the beneficiary’s experience in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3), which 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.

(D) *Other workers.* If the petition is for an unskilled (other) worker, it must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets any educational, training and experience, and other requirements of the labor certification.

The record does not contain any evidence of the beneficiary’s experience in the job offered. 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. at 165 (Comm. 1998).

The petitioner has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed. In addition, the evidence in the record of proceeding does not establish that the beneficiary meets the experience requirements of the labor certification.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.