




**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

(b)(6)




DATE: **JUN 20 2012** 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.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

Perry Rhew
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 auto repair business. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as an auto mechanic. 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 Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The priority date of the petition, which is the date the DOL accepted the labor certification for processing, is April 30, 2001. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

The director's decision denying the petition concludes that the petitioner failed to provide evidence that the beneficiary possessed the experience and special skills required by the labor certification and that the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date.

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 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 regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(b)(1) provides: "An approved permanent labor certification granted on or after July 16, 2007 *expires if not filed in support of a Form I-140 petition with the*

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).

Department of Homeland Security within 180 calendar days of the date the Department of Labor granted the certification.” (Emphasis added).

The petition was filed on April 9, 2008 with a labor certification approved by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) on September 5, 2007 and valid until March 3, 2008. Thirty-seven (37) days passed after the expiration of the labor certification’s validity date and prior to the filing of the petition with United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). As the filing of the instant case was after 180 days of the labor certification’s expiration, the petition was, therefore, filed without a valid labor certification pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(i).

It is noted that the instant petition was submitted for filing and rejected by the Service on February 25, 2008, March 5, 2008 and March 12, 2008 before being accepted as properly filed on April 9, 2008. The record is silent to the reasons for these rejections, however a search of Service electronic records shows a rejection for “incorrect or no fee” processed on March 26, 2008. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1) discusses general filing instructions:

Every application, petition, appeal, motion, request, or other document submitted on the form prescribed by this chapter shall be executed and filed in accordance with the instructions on the form, such instructions (including where an application or petition should be filed) being hereby incorporated into the particular section of the regulations in this chapter requiring its submission. The form must be filed with the appropriate filing fee required by § 103.7.

Therefore, any submission that does not include the correct fee is not considered properly filed.

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.).

As the labor certification is expired, the petition is not accompanied by a valid labor certification, and this office lacks jurisdiction to consider an appeal from the director’s decision.

Even if the appeal were not rejected, it would have been dismissed. After reviewing the record of proceeding, including new evidence submitted on appeal, the AAO concludes that the petitioner still failed to establish that the beneficiary possessed the experience and other special requirements set

(b)(6)

Page 4

forth on the labor certification, and that the petitioner also failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.