



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: JUL 02 2012 OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to 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, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner describes itself as a wholesaler of precious and semi-precious stones. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a market analyst for international trade. A Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), approved by the U.S. Department of Labor (the DOL), accompanied the petition.

The director's decision denying the petition concluded that the beneficiary did not satisfy the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The record shows that the appeal is properly filed 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 considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.¹

As noted above, the Form ETA 750 in this matter is certified by the DOL. Thus, at the outset, it is useful to discuss the DOL's role in this process. Section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) 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.

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to the DOL, or the remaining regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether the position

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). 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).

and the alien are qualified for a specific immigrant classification. This fact has not gone unnoticed by Federal Circuit Courts.

There is no doubt that the authority to make preference classification decisions rests with INS. The language of section 204 cannot be read otherwise. See *Castaneda-Gonzalez v. INS*, 564 F.2d 417, 429 (D.C. Cir. 1977). In turn, DOL has the authority to make the two determinations listed in section 212(a)(14).² Id. at 423. The necessary result of these two grants of authority is that section 212(a)(14) determinations are not subject to review by INS absent fraud or willful misrepresentation, but all matters relating to preference classification eligibility not expressly delegated to DOL remain within INS' authority.

* * *

Given the language of the Act, the totality of the legislative history, and the agencies' own interpretations of their duties under the Act, we must conclude that Congress did not intend DOL to have primary authority to make any determinations other than the two stated in section 212(a)(14). If DOL is to analyze alien qualifications, it is for the purpose of "matching" them with those of corresponding United States workers so that it will then be "in a position to meet the requirement of the law," namely the section 212(a)(14) determinations.

Madany v. Smith, 696 F.2d 1008, 1012-1013 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

Relying in part on *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008, the Ninth circuit stated:

[I]t appears that the DOL is responsible only for determining the availability of suitable American workers for a job and the impact of alien employment upon the domestic labor market. It does not appear that the DOL's role extends to determining if the alien is qualified for the job for which he seeks sixth preference status. That determination appears to be delegated to the INS under section 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), as one of the determinations incident to the INS's decision whether the alien is entitled to sixth preference status.

K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1983). The court relied on an amicus brief from the DOL that stated the following:

The labor certification made by the Secretary of Labor ... pursuant to section 212(a)(14) of the ... [Act] ... is binding as to the findings of whether there are able, willing, qualified, and available United States workers for the job offered to the alien, and whether employment of the alien under the terms set by the employer would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed United

² Based on revisions to the Act, the current citation is section 212(a)(5)(A) as set forth above.

States workers: *The labor certification in no way indicates that the alien offered the certified job opportunity is qualified (or not qualified) to perform the duties of that job.*

(Emphasis added.) *Id.* at 1009. The Ninth Circuit, citing *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006, revisited this issue, stating:

The Department of Labor (“DOL”) must certify that insufficient domestic workers are available to perform the job and that the alien’s performance of the job will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed domestic workers. *Id.* § 212(a)(14), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(14). The INS then makes its own determination of the alien’s entitlement to sixth preference status. *Id.* § 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). See generally *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 9th Cir.1983).

The INS, therefore, may make a de novo determination of whether the alien is in fact qualified to fill the certified job offer.

Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman, 736 F. 2d 1305, 1309 (9th Cir. 1984).

Therefore, it is the DOL’s responsibility to certify the terms of the labor certification, but it is the responsibility of USCIS to determine if the petition and the alien beneficiary are eligible for the classification sought.

The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a skilled worker pursuant to Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), which provides for the granting of 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. See also 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(2).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3)(ii)(B) states:

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 [labor certification]. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

The determination of whether a petition may be approved for a skilled worker is based on the requirements of the job offered as set forth on the labor certification. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(4). The labor certification must require at least two years of training and/or experience. Relevant post-secondary education may be considered as training. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(2).

Accordingly, a petition for a skilled worker must establish that the job offer portion of the labor certification requires at least two years of training and/or experience, and the beneficiary meets all of the requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification.

In evaluating 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*, 696 F.2d at 1008; *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006; *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

Where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by regulation, USCIS must examine “the language of the labor certification job requirements” in order to determine what the petitioner must demonstrate about the beneficiary’s qualifications. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. 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)(emphasis added). 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 (emphasis added). USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification or otherwise attempt to divine the employer’s intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

The job qualifications for the certified position of marketing analyst, international trade are found on Form ETA-750 Part A. Item 13 describes the job duties to be performed as follows:

Will formulate and develop strategic plans for analyzing sales and marketing programs to increase company’s profitability throughout the U.S. and North American markets. Conduct and analyze reports of progress of finances, sales and marketing efforts, the pricing and types of marketing approaches of direct competitors. Will provide cost value analysis, review and analyze by product to maximize profitability. Will prepare reports for management.

The minimum education, training, experience and skills required to perform the duties of the offered position are set forth at Part A of the labor certification and reflects the following requirements:

Block 14:

Education (number of years)

Grade school	8
High school	4
College	4

(b)(6)

College Degree Required Major Field of Study	Bachelor Marketing/Business Administration or equivalent
-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Experience:

Job Offered (or) Related Occupation	1 year [left blank]
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------

Block 15:

Other Special Requirements [left blank]

The labor certification does not state that the beneficiary can qualify for the offered position with a lesser degree, a combination of lesser degrees, and/or a quantifiable amount of work experience.³

On Part B of the labor certification, signed by the beneficiary, the beneficiary claims that she earned a Bachelor of Commerce degree in Financial Accounting and Auditing in 1996. The Form ETA 750B also states that the beneficiary worked for [redacted] India, as a marketing analyst from April 1994 January 1999.

In support of the beneficiary's educational qualifications, the petitioner submitted a copy of the beneficiary's degree from the [redacted] It indicates that the beneficiary was awarded a three-year Bachelor of Commerce degree on December 3, 1996.

The petitioner additionally submitted a credentials evaluation, dated October 17, 2003, from [redacted]

³ The DOL has provided the following field guidance: "When an equivalent degree or alternative work experience is acceptable, the employer must specifically state on the [labor certification] as well as throughout all phases of recruitment exactly what will be considered equivalent or alternative in order to qualify for the job." See Memo. from [redacted] Acting Regl. Adminstr., [redacted] 2 (June 13, 1994). The DOL's certification of job requirements stating that "a certain amount and kind of experience is the equivalent of a college degree does in no way bind [USCIS] to accept the employer's definition." See Ltr. From [redacted] Certifying Officer, [redacted] (March 9, 1993). The DOL has also stated that "[w]hen the term equivalent is used in conjunction with a degree, we understand to mean the employer is willing to accept an equivalent foreign degree." See Ltr. From [redacted] Certifying Officer, [redacted] (October 27, 1992). To our knowledge, these field guidance memoranda have not been rescinded.

Foundation of International Services, Inc. (FIS).⁴ The evaluation concludes that the beneficiary's diploma from [REDACTED] has the equivalent of three years of university-level credit from an accredited college or university in the United States.

Neither the petitioner nor the evaluator claim that the beneficiary has earned a bachelor's degree or a foreign equivalent degree. Rather, the petitioner and the evaluator claim that the combination of the beneficiary's education and work experience is equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner's intent on the labor certification was to require the worker to possess a bachelor degree in marketing or business administration or the equivalent to a bachelor's degree such as the combination of education and experience, or experience alone. Counsel interprets the Form ETA 750 as requiring "4 years Bachelor's or equiv. based on educ. + exp."

The employer's subjective intent may not be dispositive of the meaning of the actual minimum requirements of the proffered position. *Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act. No. 06-2158 (RCL) (D.C. Cir. Mar. 26, 2008), 14 n. 7. Thus, USCIS agrees that the best evidence of the petitioner's intent concerning the actual minimum educational requirements of the proffered position is evidence of how it expressed those requirements to the DOL during the labor certification process and not afterwards to USCIS. The timing of such evidence is needed to ensure inflation of those requirements is not occurring in an effort to fit the beneficiary's credentials into requirements that do not seem on their face to include what the beneficiary has.

The director issued a request for evidence (RFE) soliciting such evidence to shed light on the meaning of the educational requirement major field of study "Marketing/Business Administration or equivalent." In response, the petitioner submitted copies of recruitment material and advertisements indicating that the minimum educational requirement for the position is a bachelor's degree, with the field of study to be "marketing/business administration or equivalent." As with the labor certification, the phrase "or equivalent" relates to the field of study, not the degree.

⁴ USCIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. See *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791, 795 (Commr. 1988). However, USCIS is ultimately responsible for making the final determination regarding an alien's eligibility for the benefit sought. *Id.* The submission of letters from experts supporting the petition is not presumptive evidence of eligibility. USCIS may evaluate the content of the letters as to whether they support the alien's eligibility. See *id.* USCIS may give less weight to an opinion that is not corroborated, in accord with other information or is in any way questionable. *Id.* at 795. See also *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Commr. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Commr. 1972)); *Matter of D-R-*, 25 I&N Dec. 445 (BIA 2011)(expert witness testimony may be given different weight depending on the extent of the expert's qualifications or the relevance, reliability, and probative value of the testimony).

As is stated above, the record contains an evaluation dated October 17, 2003 from Ms. [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] evaluation indicates that the beneficiary passed the degree examination held in April of 1996 in the Second Class with the subject of Financial Accounting and Auditing and was conferred the degree of Bachelor of Commerce on December 3, 1996. The evaluator does not consider any of the beneficiary's experience. The [REDACTED] evaluation states that the beneficiary's education is "equivalent to three years of university-level credit at an accredited college or university in the United States." However, the evaluation concludes that, based on the expert opinion letters from Dr. [REDACTED] and Dr. [REDACTED] as a result of the beneficiary's education and experience, the beneficiary has an educational background the equivalent of an individual with a four-year bachelor's degree in business administration with a specialization in marketing in the United States.

The opinion letter from Dr. [REDACTED] stated that the position of market analyst requires the application of theory and principles of business normally associated with a bachelor's degree in business administration with a major in marketing and related field. Dr. [REDACTED] suggests that because the beneficiary held a position that normally would require a bachelor's degree in business administration, and based on her success in this position, she achieved the knowledge and competence associated with such degree. Thus, he concludes the beneficiary "is qualified equivalent to a bachelor's degree in business administration with a specialization in marketing or related field." Dr. [REDACTED] never concluded that the combination of the beneficiary's degree and work experience equated to a bachelor degree in marketing or business administration. He merely stated she achieved the knowledge and competence associated with such degree.

The opinion letter from Dr. [REDACTED] stated that the offered position would require a bachelor degree in business administration with a specialization in marketing or a closely related field. Dr. [REDACTED] opinion used the rule to equate three years of experience for one year of education in his conclusion that the beneficiary had the educational equivalent of a bachelor degree. However, that equivalence applies to non-immigrant H-1B petitions, not to immigrant petitions. See 8 CFR § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5).

The petitioner failed to establish that that the terms of the labor certification are ambiguous and that the petitioner intended the labor certification to require less than a four-year U.S. bachelor's or foreign equivalent degree, as that intent was expressed during the labor certification process to the DOL and potentially qualified U.S. workers.

Therefore it is concluded that the terms of the labor certification require a four-year U.S. bachelor's degree or a foreign equivalent degree. The beneficiary does not possess such a degree. The petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary met the minimum educational requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification by the priority date. Therefore, the beneficiary does not qualify for classification as a skilled worker.

We note the decision in *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. Nov. 30, 2006). In that case, the labor certification specified an educational requirement of four years of

(b)(6)

college and a "B.S. or foreign equivalent." The district court determined that "B.S. or foreign equivalent" relates solely to the alien's educational background, precluding consideration of the alien's combined education and work experience. *Snapnames.com, Inc.* at *11-13. Additionally, the court determined that the word "equivalent" in the employer's educational requirements was ambiguous and that in the context of skilled worker petitions (where there is no statutory educational requirement), deference must be given to the employer's intent. *Snapnames.com, Inc.* at *14. In addition, the court in *Snapnames.com, Inc.* recognized that 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. *Id.* at *7. Thus, the court concluded that 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.* See also *Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act No. 06-2158 (D.D.C. Mar. 26, 2008)(upholding USCIS interpretation that the term "bachelor's or equivalent" on the labor certification necessitated a single four-year degree).

In the instant case, unlike the labor certifications in *Snapnames.com, Inc.* and *Grace Korean*, the required education is clearly and unambiguously stated on the labor certification and does not include the language "or equivalent" or any other alternatives to a four-year bachelor's degree. Instead, the phrase "or equivalent" applies to the field of study. Further, the director provided the petitioner the opportunity to establish its intent regarding the term "or equivalent" on the labor certification and the minimum educational requirements of the labor certification. The petitioner failed to establish that "or equivalent" was intended to mean that the required education could be met with an alternative to a four-year U.S. bachelor's degree or foreign equivalent.

In summary, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary possessed a U.S. bachelor's degree or a foreign equivalent degree from a college or university. The petitioner therefore failed to establish that the beneficiary met the minimum educational requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification as of the priority date. Therefore, the beneficiary does not qualify for classification as a skilled worker under section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act.

Beyond the decision of the director, it is further noted that the experience letter from [REDACTED], was written by the beneficiary's father. This letter asserts that the beneficiary worked for this company from April 1994 to January 1999 on a full-time basis. However, according to the labor certification, the beneficiary was attending the [REDACTED] from August 1991 to April 1996. Therefore it is unclear how she was employed on a full-time basis, and attending the University at the same time.

The record also contains a Form G-325A signed by the beneficiary on September 18, 2002, on which she does not claim to have been employed by [REDACTED] in the past five years. 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988). If this matter is pursued any further, documentation to establish that the beneficiary was employed on a full-time basis for [REDACTED] must be submitted.

Therefore, the petitioner has not established that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its labor certification application, as certified by the DOL.

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

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.