

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B6

DATE: **MAR 08 2012** OFFICE: NEBRASKA 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 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, (director) denied the employment-based visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(I).

The petitioner is a healthcare facility. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a housekeeper/janitor. As required by statute, a labor certification approved by the Department of Labor accompanied the petition. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the petition requires more than two years of training or experience and, therefore, that the beneficiary cannot be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker. The director denied the petition accordingly.¹

The record does not contain a Form G-28 signed by both counsel and the petitioner's authorized representative.² U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services' (USCIS) regulations and precedent decisions specifically limit the filing of an appeal to the affected party, i.e., in the instant case, the petitioner. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii)(B). The Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, that was submitted for the record for the Form I-290B was signed by the representative of the beneficiary and [REDACTED] not by an authorized representative of the petitioner.³ The beneficiary of a visa petition is not a recognized party on

¹ The record of proceeding confirms that the petitioner requested the skilled worker classification on the Form I-140. However, the Form ETA 750 states that an applicant must have at least six months of experience in the offered job. 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*, 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). Counsel states on appeal that the Form I-140 should be amended to reflect that an unskilled worker classification was being requested. However, 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). Therefore, even if the appeal had been properly filed, the appeal would still have been dismissed.

² The AAO recognizes that counsel for the petitioner and [REDACTED] is the same. However, as discussed below, there is no evidence in the record that the appeal was submitted by an authorized representative of the petitioner.

³ There is no evidence in the record to suggest, and counsel does not allege, that appellant is a successor-in-interest to [REDACTED] the petitioner in these proceedings. A valid successor relationship may be established if the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification; if the purported successor establishes eligibility in all respects, including the provision of evidence from the predecessor entity, such as evidence of the predecessor's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date; and if the petition fully describes and documents the transfer and assumption of the ownership of the predecessor by the claimed successor. Evidence of transfer of ownership must show that the successor not only purchased the predecessor's assets but

appeal. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(3). As the beneficiary and his new employer, [REDACTED] are not recognized parties in this matter, the new employer's counsel would not be authorized to file the appeal in this matter. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii)(B); 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(1).

However, given the novel issue raised by the appeal, i.e., whether AC21 permits the new employer to have legal standing in this proceeding, the AAO will address this.⁴ To make this determination, the AAO must therefore discuss whether a new employer takes the place of an original petitioner in AC21 situations where the beneficiary's I-485 has been pending for 180 days or more.

As noted above, the initial petition was denied based on the petitioner's failure to establish that the petition requires at least two years of training or experience and, therefore, that the beneficiary cannot be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker. As the initial petition was denied, the beneficiary seeks portability based on an unapproved I-140 petition. No related statute or regulation would render the beneficiary portable under these facts.

The pertinent section of AC 21, Section 106(c)(1), amended section 204 of the Act, codified at section 204(j) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(j) provides:

Job Flexibility For Long Delayed Applicants For Adjustment Of Status To Permanent Residence. - A petition under subsection (a)(1)(D) [since redesignated section 204(a)(1)(F)] for an individual whose application for adjustment of status pursuant to section 245 has been filed and remained unadjudicated for 180 days or more shall remain valid with respect to a new job if the individual changes jobs or employers if the new job is in the same or a similar occupational classification as the job for which the petition was filed.

Section 212(a)(5)(A)(iv) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(5)(A)(iv), states further:

Long Delayed Adjustment Applicants- A certification made under clause (i) with respect to an individual whose petition is covered by section 204(j) shall remain valid with respect to a new job accepted by the individual after the individual changes jobs or employers if the new job is in the same or a similar occupational classification as the job for which the certification was issued.

also that the successor acquired the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business in the same manner as the predecessor. The successor must continue to operate the same type of business as the predecessor, and the manner in which the business is controlled must remain substantially the same as it was before the ownership transfer. The successor must also establish its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage from the date of business transfer until the beneficiary adjusts status to lawful permanent resident. *Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.* 19 I&N Dec. 481 (Comm. 1981).

⁴ The beneficiary's counsel will be provided a courtesy copy of this decision.

Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act includes the immigrant classification for individuals holding baccalaureate degrees who are members of the professions and skilled workers under section 203(b)(3) of the Act, the classification sought in the petition.

Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act provides that: “Any employer desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification under section 1153(b)(1)(B), 1153(b)(1)(C), 1153(b)(2), or 1153(b)(3) of this title may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.”

Once an alien has an approved petition, section 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1155 (2004), allows the beneficiary to adjust status to an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence:

The status of an alien who was inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States or the status of any other alien having an approved petition for classification under subparagraph (A)(iii), (A)(iv), (B)(ii), or (B)(iii) of section 204(a)(1) or may be adjusted by the [Secretary of Homeland Security], in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if (1) the alien makes an application for such adjustment, (2) the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence, and (3) an immigrant visa is immediately available to him at the time his application is filed.

An immigrant visa is immediately available to an alien seeking employment-based preference classification under section 203(b) of the Act (such as the beneficiary in this case) when the alien’s visa petition has been approved and his or her priority date is current. 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2). Hence, adjustment of status may only be granted “by virtue of a valid visa petition approved in [the alien’s] behalf.” 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(2).

After enactment of the portability provisions of AC21, on July 31, 2002, USCIS published an interim rule allowing for the concurrent filing of Form I-140 petitions and Form I-485 petitions, whereby an employer may file an employment-based immigrant visa petition and an application for adjustment of status for the alien beneficiary at the same time without the need to wait for an approved I-140 petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245.2(a)(2)(B)(2004); *see also* 67 Fed. Reg. 49561 (July 31, 2002). The beneficiary in the instant matter filed his Form I-485 petition on July 23, 2007, but the petitioner filed the Form I-140 petition on July 9, 2007.

USCIS implemented concurrent filing as a convenience for aliens and their U.S. employers. Because section 204(j) of the Act applies only in adjustment proceedings, USCIS never suggested that concurrent filing would make the portability provision relevant to the adjudication of the underlying visa petition. Rather, the statute and regulations prescribe that aliens seeking employment-based preference classification must have an immigrant visa petition approved on their behalf before they are even eligible for adjustment of status. Section 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a); 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2).

Section 204(j) of the Act prescribes that “A petition . . . shall remain valid with respect to a new job if the individual changes jobs or employers.” The term “valid” is not defined by the statute, nor does the congressional record provide any guidance as to its meaning. *See* S. Rep. 106-260, 2000 WL 622763 (Apr. 11, 2000); *see also* H.R. Rep. 106-1048, 2001 WL 67919 (Jan. 2, 2001). However, the statutory language and framework for granting immigrant status, along with recent decisions of three federal circuit courts of appeals, clearly show that the term “valid,” as used in section 204(j) of the Act, refers to an approved visa petition.

Statutory interpretation begins with the language of the statute itself. *Hughey v. U.S.*, 495 U.S. 411, 415 (1990). We are expected to give the words used in the statute their ordinary meaning. *I.N.S. v. Cardoza-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 431 (1987) (citing *I.N.S. v. Phinpathya*, 464 U.S. 183, 189 (1984)). We must also construe the language in question in harmony with the thrust of related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *K Mart Corp. v. Cartier Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988). *See also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561, 573 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1996).

With regard to the overall design of the nation’s immigration laws, section 204 of the Act provides the basic statutory framework for the granting of immigrant status. Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(F), provides that “[a]ny employer desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification under section . . . 203(b)(1)(B) . . . of this title may file a petition with the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] for such classification.” (Emphasis added.)

Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), governs USCIS’s authority to approve an immigrant visa petition before immigrant status is granted:

After an investigation of the facts in each case . . . the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is . . . eligible for preference under subsection (a) or (b) of section 203, approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

Thus, the statute and regulations allow adjustment only where the alien has an approved petition for immigrant classification. Section 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a); 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2).⁵

⁵ We note that the Act contains at least one provision that does apply to pending petitions; in that instance, Congress specifically used the word “pending.” *See* Section 101(a)(15)(V) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(V) (establishing a nonimmigrant visa for aliens with family-based petitions that have been pending three years or more).

Pursuant to the statutory framework for the granting of immigrant status, any United States employer desiring and intending to employ an alien “entitled” to immigrant classification under the Act “may file” a petition for classification. Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(F). However, section 204(b) of the Act mandates that USCIS approve that petition only after investigating the facts in each case, determining that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien is eligible for the requested classification. Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). Hence, Congress specifically granted USCIS the sole authority to approve an immigrant visa petition; an alien may not adjust status or be granted immigrant status by the Department of State until USCIS approves the petition.

Therefore, to be considered “valid” in harmony with the portability provision of section 204(j) of the Act and with the statute as a whole, an immigrant visa petition must have been filed for an alien that is entitled to the requested classification and that petition must have been approved by USCIS pursuant to the agency’s authority under the Act. *See generally* section 204 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154. A petition is not validated merely through the act of filing the petition with USCIS or through the passage of 180 days.

Section 204(j) of the Act cannot be interpreted as allowing the adjustment of status of an alien based on an unapproved visa petition when section 245(a) of the Act explicitly requires an approved petition (or eligibility for an immediately available immigrant visa) in order to grant adjustment of status. To construe section 204(j) of the Act in that manner would violate the “elementary canon of construction that a statute should be interpreted so as not to render one part inoperative.” *Dept. of Revenue of Or. v. ACF Indus., Inc.*, 510 U.S. 332, 340 (1994).

Accordingly, it would subvert the statutory scheme of the U.S. immigration laws to find that a petition is valid when that petition was never approved or, even if it was approved, if it was filed on behalf of an alien that was never entitled to the requested immigrant classification. We will not construe section 204(j) of the Act in a manner that would allow ineligible aliens to gain immigrant status simply by filing visa petitions and adjustment applications, thereby increasing USCIS backlogs, in the hopes that the application might remain unadjudicated for 180 days.

In a case pertaining to the revocation of an I-140 petition, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals determined that the government’s authority to revoke a Form I-140 petition under section 205 of the Act survived portability under section 204(j) of the Act. *Herrera v. USCIS*, 2009 WL 1911596 (9th Cir. July 6, 2009). Citing a 2005 AAO decision, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that in order to remain valid under section 204(j) of the Act, the I-140 petition must have been valid from the start. The Ninth Circuit stated that if the plaintiff’s argument prevailed, an alien who exercised portability would be shielded from revocation, but an alien who remained with the petitioning employer would not share the same immunity. The Ninth Circuit noted that it was not the intent of Congress to grant extra benefits to those who changed jobs. Under the plaintiff’s interpretation, an applicant would have a very large incentive to change jobs in order to guarantee that the approval of an I-140 petition could not be revoked. *Id.* In the current matter, the appellant is attempting to shield a ported alien not from the revocation of a petition, but from the withdrawal of an unapproved petition, which is

just as inconsistent with Congressional intent, if not more so, as the argument posed by the plaintiff in *Herrera*.⁶

In the case at hand, the I-140 petition was denied. The beneficiary would therefore not have a valid immigrant visa petition approved on his behalf to be eligible for adjustment of status. Section 245(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a); 8 C.F.R. § 245.1(g)(1), (2).

The enactment of the portability provision at section 204(j) of the Act did not repeal or modify sections 204(b) and 245(a) of the Act, which require USCIS to approve an immigrant visa petition prior to granting adjustment of status. Accordingly, as this petition was denied, it cannot be deemed valid by improper invocation of section 204(j) of the Act.

Counsel has failed to show that the passage of AC21 granted any rights, much less benefits, to subsequent employers of aliens eligible for the job portability provisions of section 106(c). Based on a review of the statute and legislative history, the AAO must reject counsel's suggestion that the new employer, [REDACTED] has now become the petitioner, and an affected party, in these proceedings.

As the appeal was not properly filed, and it is unclear whether or not the petitioner consented to having an appeal filed on its behalf, it will be rejected. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(I).

ORDER: The appeal is rejected as improperly filed.

⁶ Moreover, every federal circuit court of appeals that has discussed the portability provision of section 204(j) of the Act has done so only in the context of deciding an immigration judge's jurisdiction to determine the continuing validity of an approved visa petition when adjudicating an alien's application for adjustment of status in removal proceedings. *Sung v. Keisler*, 2007 WL 3052778 (5th Cir. Oct. 22, 2007); *Matovski v. Gonzales*, 492 F.3d 722 (6th Cir. Jun. 15, 2007); *Perez-Vargas v. Gonzales*, 478 F.3d 191 (4th Cir. 2007). In *Sung*, the court quoted section 204(j) of the Act and explained that the provision only addresses when "an *approved* immigration petition will remain valid for the purpose of an application of adjustment of status." *Sung*, 2007 WL 3052778 at *1 (emphasis added). *Accord Matovski*, 492 F.3d at 735 (discussing portability as applied to an alien who had a "previously approved I-140 Petition for Alien Worker"); *Perez-Vargas*, 478 F.3d at 193 (stating that "[s]ection 204(j) . . . provides relief to the alien who changes jobs after his visa petition has been approved"). Hence, the requisite approval of the underlying visa petition is explicit in each of these decisions.