


(b)(6)

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




DATE: OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

DEC 18 2012

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.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center (director), denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed the decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be rejected.

The petitioner describes itself as an information technology consultant. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a database administrator. 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).

The petition is accompanied by a photocopy of a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The original labor certification was not provided. The priority date of the petition, which is the date the DOL accepted the labor certification for processing, is February 18, 2003. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

This petition involves the substitution of a beneficiary on the labor certification. The substitution of beneficiaries was formerly permitted by the DOL. On May 17, 2007, the DOL issued a final rule prohibiting the substitution of beneficiaries on labor certifications effective July 16, 2007. *See* 72 Fed. Reg. 27904 (to be codified at 20 C.F.R. § 656). The filing of the instant petition predates the final rule.

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.¹

The director's decision denying the petition concludes that the original beneficiary of the labor certification had already obtained lawful permanent residence based on the labor certification and therefore it could not be used for an additional substituted beneficiary.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may not approve a visa petition when the approved labor certification has already been used by another alien. *See Matter of Harry Bailen Builders, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 412, 414 (Comm'r 1986).² When Congress enacted the job flexibility provision of section 204(j) of the Act, Congress made no correlative amendments to the admissibility requirements of section 212(a)(5)(C) of the Act that would allow a labor certification to be used as evidence of admissibility for two or more aliens.³ The AAO must conclude that Congress

¹ The 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).

² While *Harry Bailen*, 19 I&N Dec. at 414, relies in part on language in 8 C.F.R. § 204.4(f) that no longer exists in the regulations, the decision also relies in DOL's regulations, which continue to hold that a labor certification is valid only for a specific job opportunity. 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(c)(2). Moreover, the reasoning in *Harry Bailen*, 19 I&N Dec. at 414 has been adopted in recent cases: *See Matter of Francisco Javier Villarreal-Zuniga*, 23 I&N Dec. 886, 889-90 (BIA 2006).

³ Under such an interpretation, a substituted alien could also "port" to a new employer under AC21,

was aware of the agency's previous interpretation that a labor certification can only support the adjustment of one alien under the Act when the American Competitiveness in the Twenty-first Century Act of 2000 (AC21) (Public Law 106-313) was passed and did not specifically alter that interpretation. *See Lorillard v. Pons*, 434 U.S. 575, 580-81 (1978) (Congress is presumed to be aware of administrative and judicial interpretations where it adopts a new law incorporating sections of a prior law). The labor certification on which the underlying petition is based has already served as the basis of admissibility for a different alien and is no longer "valid." Counsel provides no legal authority, and the AAO knows of none, that would allow USCIS to rely on the labor certification of an adjusted alien to adjust a second alien. Therefore, the labor certification submitted with the instant petition is not valid for the beneficiary.

The labor certification is evidence of an individual alien's admissibility under section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act, which 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.

The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) delegates the authority to adjudicate appeals to the AAO pursuant to the authority vested in her through the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-296. *See* DHS Delegation Number 0150.1 (effective March 1, 2003); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 2.1 (2003). The AAO exercises appellate jurisdiction over the matters described at 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii) (as in effect on February 28, 2003). *See* DHS Delegation Number 0150.1(U) *supra*; 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(iv).

Among the appellate authorities are appeals from denials of petitions for immigrant visa classification based on employment, "except when the denial of the petition is based upon lack of a certification by the Secretary of Labor under section 212(a)(5)(A) of the Act." 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii)(B) (2003 ed.).

Since the denial of the petition is based upon the lack of a valid labor certification, the AAO does not have jurisdiction to consider an appeal of the director's decision.

allowing the employer to once again substitute a new beneficiary, resulting in a theoretically unlimited number of aliens adjusting status pursuant to a single labor certification.

(b)(6)

Page 4

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.