







U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




DATE: FEB 05 2013 OFFICE: NEBRASKSA 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 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,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center (the director), 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 is a mass appraisal and property tax business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a programmer analyst. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750,¹ Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor (the DOL), accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary satisfied 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, timely 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.²

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), also provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's priority date. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). The priority date of the petition is January 5, 2004, which is the date the labor certification was accepted for processing by the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).³ The Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140) was filed on August 13, 2007.

¹ After March 28, 2005, the correct form to apply for labor certification is the Form ETA 9089.

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). 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).

³ If the petition is approved, the priority date is also used in conjunction with the Visa Bulletin issued by the Department of State to determine when a beneficiary can apply for adjustment of status or for an immigrant visa abroad. Thus, the importance of reviewing the *bona fides* of a job opportunity as of the priority date is clear.

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

Work as part of the team and will design and develop computer applications in mass appraisal and property tax administration using Oracle, Developer 2000, Forms, Reports, PL/SQL and SQL Plus.

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:

EDUCATION

Grade School:

High School:

College: X years

College Degree Required: Bachelor's degree

Major Field of Study: any

TRAINING:

EXPERIENCE: two (2) years in the job offered

OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: at least two (2) years of experience in Oracle, Developer 2000, Forms, Reports, PL/SQL and SQL plus; and six (6) months experience in mass appraisal and property tax administration.

As set forth above, the proffered position requires a Bachelor's degree in any field of study and two (2) years of experience in the job offered.

In support of the beneficiary's educational qualifications, the petitioner submitted a copy of the beneficiary's diploma and transcripts from the [REDACTED]. It indicates that the beneficiary holds a Bachelor of Science (three-year integrated course) degree from the [REDACTED].

The record also contains an [REDACTED] Certificate of completion for [REDACTED] from August 1996 to November 1996; a [REDACTED] Certificate of completion of [REDACTED] in July 1998; and a [REDACTED] Certificate of completion of QA & [REDACTED] on July 5, 1999. Counsel does not contend that the beneficiary meets the minimum education requirements of the labor certification through the completion of these computer courses and the certificates were not granted by any known university or college and are not recognized in the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) as having any U.S. degree equivalency.

The petitioner additionally submitted credentials evaluations: an evaluation of the beneficiary's credentials prepared by [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] on August 30, 1999 concludes that the beneficiary's Bachelor of Science degree from the [REDACTED] combined with various training certificates in Computer Science from computer schools in India and the United States are

equivalent to a four-year Bachelor of Science degree specializing in Computer Science; an evaluation of the beneficiary's credentials prepared by [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] on March 7, 2009 concludes that the beneficiary's Bachelor of Science degree from the [REDACTED] is equivalent to a Bachelor of Science with a major in Chemistry; and an evaluation of the beneficiary's credentials prepared by [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] on March 9, 2009 concludes that the beneficiary's Bachelor of Science degree from the [REDACTED] is equivalent to a Bachelor of Science with a major in Chemistry.

On April 7, 2009, the Nebraska Service Center director denied the petition. The director's decision concludes that the beneficiary does not have a U.S. bachelor's degree or foreign equivalent degree as required by the terms of the labor certification.

On appeal, with regard to the beneficiary's qualifying academic credentials, prior counsel⁴, submitted a memoranda; copies of the beneficiary's education documents; copies of the above-referenced evaluations; and a copy of the revised syllabus for a bachelor of science degree at the [REDACTED]

The position requires a bachelor's degree in any field and two (2) years of experience, which is more than the minimum required by the regulatory guidance for professional positions found at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C). Thus the certified position must be considered as a professional occupation.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) states the following:

If the petition is for a professional, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien holds a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and by evidence that the alien is a member of the professions. Evidence of a baccalaureate degree shall be in the form of an official college or university record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study. To show that the alien is a member of the professions, the petitioner must submit evidence that the minimum of a baccalaureate degree is required for entry into the occupation.

The above regulation uses a singular description of foreign equivalent degree. Thus, the plain meaning of the regulatory language concerning the professional classification sets forth the requirement that a beneficiary must produce one degree that is determined to be the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree in order to be qualified as a professional for third preference visa category purposes.

⁴ In response to the AAO's request for evidence (RFE) new counsel, [REDACTED] herein referred to as counsel, filed a Form G-28, Notice of Appearance of Attorney or Representative on behalf of the petitioner.

(b)(6)

On November 8, 2012, the AAO issued a request for evidence (RFE) to the petitioner. In this request, the AAO noted that there was no evidence in the record of proceeding that the beneficiary ever enrolled in classes beyond her academic studies at the [REDACTED]. The AAO also noted that the petitioner did not specify on the Form ETA 750 that the minimum academic requirements of a Bachelor's of Science degree might be met through a combination of lesser degrees and/or a quantifiable amount of work experience. The AAO further advised that according to the Fifth Edition (2003) of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officer (AACRAO) *Foreign Educational Credentials Required*, a three-year Bachelor of Science degree from India is comparable to "two to three years of university study in the United States" and that the labor certification application, as certified, did not demonstrate that the petitioner would accept a combination of degrees that are individually less than a four-year U.S. bachelor's degree or its foreign equivalent and/or a quantifiable amount of work experience when the labor market test was conducted.

The AAO also advised that the evaluations from [REDACTED] were inconsistent with the original evaluation from [REDACTED], which found that the beneficiary's Bachelor of Science degree required combination with post-graduate course study to equal a four-year tertiary Bachelor of Science degree in the United States. It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988).

In response to the RFE, counsel submits copies of information from the International Affairs Office of the U.S. Department of Education; a new evaluation for the beneficiary's qualifications from Cultural House, Inc.; Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Forms W-2, Tax and Wage Statements for the beneficiary; documentation regarding it's ability to pay the proffered wage; and copies of documentation already in the record.

At the outset, it is noted that section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act and the scope of the regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.1(a) describe the role of the DOL in the labor certification process as follows:

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 left to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to determine whether the proffered position and alien qualify for a specific immigrant classification or even the job offered. 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).⁵ *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).⁶

In 1991, when the final rule for 8 C.F.R. § 204.5 was published in the Federal Register, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now USCIS or the Service), responded to criticism that the

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

⁶ The Ninth Circuit, citing *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006, has stated:

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).

regulation required an alien to have a bachelor's degree as a minimum and that the regulation did not allow for the substitution of experience for education. After reviewing section 121 of the Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-649 (1990), and the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference, the Service specifically noted that both the Act and the legislative history indicate that an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree: "[B]oth the Act and its legislative history make clear that, in order to qualify as a professional under the third classification or to have experience equating to an advanced degree under the second, *an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree.*" 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60900 (November 29, 1991)(emphasis added).

There is no provision in the statute or the regulations that would allow a beneficiary to qualify under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act with anything less than a full baccalaureate degree. More specifically, a three-year bachelor's degree will not be considered to be the "foreign equivalent degree" to a United States baccalaureate degree. A United States baccalaureate degree is generally found to require four years of education. *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. 244 (Reg. Comm. 1977). Where the analysis of the beneficiary's credentials relies on work experience alone or a combination of multiple lesser degrees, the result is the "equivalent" of a bachelor's degree rather than a single-source "foreign equivalent degree." In order to have experience and education equating to a bachelor's degree under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, the beneficiary must have a single degree that is the "foreign equivalent degree" to a United States baccalaureate degree.

We note the decision in *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. November 30, 2006). In that case, the labor certification application specified an educational requirement of four years of 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. *Id.* 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. *Id.* at 14. However, in professional and advanced degree professional cases, where the beneficiary is statutorily required to hold a baccalaureate degree, the court determined that USCIS properly concluded that a single foreign degree or its equivalent is required. *Id.* at 17, 19. In the instant case, unlike the labor certification in *Snapnames.com, Inc.*, the petitioner's intent regarding educational equivalence is clearly stated on the ETA 750 and does not include alternatives to a four-year bachelor's degree. 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 (RCL) (D.C. Cir. March 26, 2008)(upholding an interpretation that a "bachelor's or equivalent" requirement necessitated a single four-year degree). In this matter, the Form ETA 750 does not specify an equivalency to the requirement of a bachelor's degree in any field.

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). Where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by professional regulation, USCIS must examine "the language of the labor certification job requirements" in order to determine what the petitioner must demonstrate that the beneficiary has to be found qualified for the position. *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 application form]." *Id.* at 834 (emphasis added). USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that DOL has formally issued or otherwise attempt to divine the employer's intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

Moreover, for classification as a member of the professions, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) requires the submission of "an official *college or university* record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study." (Emphasis added.) Moreover, it is significant that both the statute, section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, and relevant regulations use the word "degree" in relation to professionals. A statute should be construed under the assumption that Congress intended it to have purpose and meaningful effect. *Mountain States Tel. & Tel. v. Pueblo of Santa Ana*, 472 U.S. 237, 249 (1985); *Sutton v. United States*, 819 F.2d. 1289, 1295 (5th Cir. 1987). It can be presumed that Congress' narrow requirement of a "degree" for members of the professions is deliberate. Significantly, in another context, Congress has broadly referenced "the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning." Section 203(b)(2)(C) (relating to aliens of exceptional ability). Thus, the requirement at section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) that an eligible alien both have a baccalaureate "degree" and be a member of the professions reveals that member of the profession must have a *degree* and that a diploma or certificate from an institution of learning other than a college or university is a potentially similar but distinct type of credential. Thus, even if we did not require "a" degree that is the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate, we could not consider education earned at an institution other than a college or university.

Moreover, as advised in the RFE issued to the petitioner by this office, we have reviewed the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). According to its website, AACRAO is "a nonprofit, voluntary, professional association of more than 11,000 higher education admissions and registration professionals who represent more than 2,600 institutions and agencies in the United States and in over 40 countries around the world." See <http://www.aacrao.org/About-AACRAO.aspx>. Its mission "is to serve and advance higher education by providing leadership in

academic and enrollment services.” *Id.* EDGE is “a web-based resource for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials.” <http://edge.aacrao.org/info.php>. Authors for EDGE are not merely expressing their personal opinions. Rather, they must work with a publication consultant and a Council Liaison with AACRAO’s National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials.⁷ If placement recommendations are included, the Council Liaison works with the author to give feedback and the publication is subject to final review by the entire Council. *Id.* USCIS considers EDGE to be a reliable, peer-reviewed source of information about foreign credentials equivalencies.⁸

EDGE’s credential advice provides that a 3 year Bachelor’s degree is comparable to “3 years of university study in the United States. Credit may be awarded on a course-by-course basis.”

The evaluation of the beneficiary’s credentials submitted in response to the RFE and prepared by [REDACTED] on December 6, 2012, concludes that the beneficiary’s Bachelor of Science degree from the [REDACTED] is equivalent to a four-year Bachelor of Science degree in chemistry. While the evaluation explains that the prior evaluation relied upon education and experience outside the beneficiary’s degree due to H-1B requirements and finds that the beneficiary’s degree by itself is equivalent to a bachelors in chemistry, the evaluation fails to address EDGE’s credential advice in regard to the beneficiary’s qualifications.

The fundamental argument of all the evaluations is that a three-year bachelor's degree from India is equivalent to a 120 credit hour U.S. bachelor's degree, because an Indian three-year degree requires the same number of classroom hours (or "contact hours") as a U.S. bachelor's degree. The evaluations claim that a student must attend at least 15 50-minute classroom hours to earn one semester credit hour under the U.S. system. Since U.S. bachelor's degree programs require 120 credit hours for graduation, the evaluations conclude that a program of study with 1800 classroom hours is equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree. Since a three-year bachelor's degree from India

⁷ See *An Author's Guide to Creating AACRAO International Publications* available at http://www.aacrao.org/Libraries/Publications_Documents/GUIDE_TO_CREATING_INTERNATIONAL_PUBLICATIONS_1.sflb.ashx.

⁸ In *Confluence Intern., Inc. v. Holder*, 2009 WL 825793 (D.Minn. March 27, 2009), the court determined that the AAO provided a rational explanation for its reliance on information provided by AACRAO to support its decision. In *Tisco Group, Inc. v. Napolitano*, 2010 WL 3464314 (E.D.Mich. August 30, 2010), the court found that USCIS had properly weighed the evaluations submitted and the information obtained from EDGE to conclude that the alien’s three-year foreign “baccalaureate” and foreign “Master’s” degree were only comparable to a U.S. bachelor’s degree. In *Sunshine Rehab Services, Inc.* 2010 WL 3325442 (E.D.Mich. August 20, 2010), the court upheld a USCIS determination that the alien’s three-year bachelor’s degree was not a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. bachelor’s degree. Specifically, the court concluded that USCIS was entitled to prefer the information in EDGE and did not abuse its discretion in reaching its conclusion. The court also noted that the labor certification itself required a degree and did not allow for the combination of education and experience.

(b)(6)

allegedly requires over 1800 classroom hours, the evaluations conclude that it is equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree.

The evaluations base this equivalency formula on the claim that the U.S. semester credit hour is a variant of the "Carnegie Unit." The Carnegie Unit was adopted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the early 1900s as a measure of the amount of classroom time that a high school student studied a subject.⁹ For example, 120 hours of classroom time was determined to be equal to one "unit" of high school credit, and 14 "units" were deemed to constitute the minimum amount of classroom time equivalent to four years of high school. This unit system was adopted at a time when high schools lacked uniformity in the courses they taught and the number of hours students spent in class.¹⁰ According to the foundation's website, the "Carnegie Unit" relates to the number of classroom hours a high school student should have with a teacher, and "does not apply to higher education."¹¹

USCIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, the Service is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm. 1988); see also *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). Additionally, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) is clear in allowing only for the equivalency of one foreign degree to a United States baccalaureate.

The Form ETA 750 does not provide that the minimum academic requirements of a Bachelor's degree in any field might be met through three years of college or some other formula other than that explicitly stated on the Form ETA 750.

The beneficiary does not have a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree, and, thus, does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act.

Even if the petition qualified for skilled worker consideration, the beneficiary does not meet the terms of the labor certification, and the petition would be denied on that basis as well. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(B) (requiring evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification).

⁹ The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was founded in 1905 as an independent policy and research center, "Improving teaching and learning has always been Carnegie's motivation and heritage." <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/about-us/about-carnegie> (accessed January 17, 2013).

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

(b)(6)

Page 11

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.