(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: MAR 2 9 2012 Office: NEBRASKA 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, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner operates a skilled nursing and rehab facility, and seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a registered nurse, a professional or skilled worker, pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3).

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and who are members of the professions. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2), and 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. *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii).

The petitioner has applied for the beneficiary under a blanket labor certification pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.5, Schedule A, Group I. *See also* 20 C.F.R. § 656.15. Schedule A is the list of occupations set forth at 20 C.F.R. § 656.5 with respect to which the United States Department of Labor (DOL) has determined that there are not sufficient United States workers who are able, willing, qualified and available, and that the employment of aliens in such occupations will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of United States workers similarly employed.

Based on 8 C.F.R. §§ 204.5(a)(2) and (l)(3)(i) an applicant for a Schedule A position would file Form I-140, "accompanied by any required individual labor certification, application for Schedule A designation, or evidence that the alien's occupation qualifies as a shortage occupation within the Department of Labor's Labor Market Information Pilot Program."[1] The priority date of any petition filed for classification under section 203(b) of the Act "shall be the date the completed, signed petition (including all initial evidence and the correct fee) is properly filed with [United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)]." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

Pursuant to the regulations set forth in Title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the filing must include evidence of prearranged employment for the alien beneficiary. The employment is evidenced by the employer's completion of the job offer description on the application form and evidence that the employer has provided appropriate notice of filing the Application for Alien Employment Certification to the bargaining representative or to the employer's employees as set forth in 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d).

---

[1] On March 28, 2005, pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.17, the Application for Permanent Employment Certification, ETA-9089 replaced the Application for Alien Employment Certification, Form ETA 750. The new Form ETA 9089 was introduced in connection with the re-engineered permanent foreign labor certification program (PERM), which was published in the Federal Register on December 27, 2004 with an effective date of March 28, 2005. *See* 69 Fed. Reg. 77326 (Dec. 27, 2004).

Also, according to 20 C.F.R. § 656.5(a)(2), aliens who will be permanently employed as professional nurses must (1) have received a Certificate from the Commission on Graduates of Foreign Nursing Schools (CGFNS), (2) hold a permanent, full and unrestricted license to practice professional nursing in the state of intended employment, or (3) have passed the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN), administered by the National Council of State Boards of Nursing.

On May 4, 2009, the director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to submit a valid prevailing wage determination in accordance with 20 C.F.R. § 656.40.

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.[2]

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely and makes an 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.

On appeal, counsel states that the petition was denied in error because the petitioner submitted printouts from the Online Wage Library (OWL), which counsel asserts is "synonymous with the prevailing wage determination from EDD."

A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm'r 1988).

The petitioner failed to obtain a prevailing wage determination (PWD) in compliance with 20 C.F.R. § 656.40 from the relevant State Workforce Agency (SWA) prior to filing. The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.40 specifically sets forth that the petitioner must request a wage and the wage obtained is assigned a validity period. In order to use a prevailing wage determination (PWD), "employers must file their [Schedule A] applications or begin the recruitment required by §§ 656.17(d) or 656.21 within the validity period specified by the SWA." *See* 20 C.F.R. § 656.40(c). The petitioner must file Form ETA 9089 and Form I-140 with the prevailing wage determination issued by the SWA having jurisdiction over the proposed area of employment. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 656.15(b)(i). A petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing. *See Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm'r 1971).

The record shows that the instant Schedule A application was filed on February 29, 2008. The PERM regulations expressly state that an employer must file its application within the validity period specified by the SWA. On February 10, 2009, the director issued a Request for Evidence (RFE) requesting a

[2] 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).

valid PWD. On March 10, 2009, the petitioner responded by submitting a printout from OWL dated February 22, 2008. Without citation to statutory or regulatory authority, precedent, or policy, counsel stated that the OWL printout was "utilized because it is a reliable source for Prevailing wage determination." In the instant case, the petitioner did not file its Schedule A application with a valid PWD in accordance with clear regulatory guidance. Therefore, the petitioner failed to comply with the requirements of 20 C.F.R. § 656.40 with respect to the PWD.

The petitioner failed to file the petition with a copy of a valid prevailing wage determination. Accordingly, the petitioner has failed to meet the regulatory requirements, which require that the PWD be completed prior to filing the Schedule A application.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner failed to provide evidence that notice of filing was posted in any in-house media in accordance with 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d)(iii).

The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d) provides:

> (ii) If there is no such bargaining representative, by posted notice to the employer's employees at the facility or location of the employment. The notice must be posted for at least 10 consecutive business days. The notice must be clearly visible and unobstructed while posted and must be posted in conspicuous places where the employer's U.S. workers can readily read the posted notice on their way to or from their place of employment. Appropriate locations for posting notices of the job opportunity include locations in the immediate vicinity of wage and hour notices required by 29 CFR 516.4 or occupational safety and health notices required by 29 CFR 1903.2(a). *In addition, the employer must publish the notice in any and all in-house media, whether electronic or printed, in accordance with the normal procedures used for the recruitment of similar positions in the employer's organization. The documentation requirement may be satisfied by providing a copy of the posted notice and stating where it was posted, and by providing copies of all in-house media, whether electronic or print, that were used to distribute notice of the application in accordance with the procedures used for similar positions within the employer's organization.*

(Emphasis added).

20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d) does not define "in-house media" or what sources in-house media would comprise. The initial PERM regulation published at 69 Fed. Reg. 77326 provides only that the posting must be "published in any and all in-house media in accordance with the normal procedures used for the recruitment of other similar positions." 69 Fed. Reg. at 77338.

DOL's FAQ response "Round 10" provides that "the regulations require that the employer publish the notice internally using in-house media – whether electronic or print – in accordance with the normal internal procedures used by the employer to notify its employees of employment opportunities in the occupation in question." *See* http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/faqsanswers.cfm (accessed March 20, 2012). The FAQ response further provides that:

> The language should give sufficient notice to interested persons of the employer's having filed an application for permanent alien labor certification . . . it is not required to mirror, word for word, the physical posting... . In every case, the Notice of Filing that is posted to the employer's in-house media must state the rate of pay and apprise the reader that any person may provide documentary evidence bearing on the application to the Certifying Officer.

DOL's FAQ response notes that the posting contemplates internal notification of the petitioner's employees rather than external notification to the public at large. Further, the posting requirement relates to the employer's "*normal procedures used for the recruitment of similar positions in the employer's organization.*"

Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO finds that the petition lacks evidence that the notice of job opportunity was posted at least 30 days prior to filing the petition, as required by 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d)(3)(iv).

The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(3) provides:

> (3) The notice of the filing of an Application for Permanent Employment Certification shall:
>
> (i) State that the notice is being provided as a result of the filing of an application for permanent alien labor certification for the relevant job opportunity;
> (ii) State any person may provide documentary evidence bearing on the application to the Certifying Officer of the Department of Labor;
> (iii) Provide the address of the appropriate Certifying Officer; and
> (iv) Be provided between 30 and 180 days before filing the application.

As set forth above, the petitioner must have posted the notice pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d)(3)(iv) for 30 to 180 days prior to the February 29, 2008 filing. In the instant case, the posting notice indicates that the posting was removed on February 15, 2008. The petitioner filed the petition less than 30 days later, on February 29, 2008. Thus, the posting notice was deficient, as it was posted less than 30 days prior to filing.

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.