


(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: OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE:

FEB 21 2013



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 be "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Acting 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 remanded to the director for further consideration and action in accordance with this decision.

The petitioner describes itself as a retail convenience store. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as an assistant manager. 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).¹

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 concluded that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary possessed the employment experience required to perform the offered position as set forth on the labor certification. The director also concluded that the claims pertaining to the beneficiary's employment experience constituted fraud.

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 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 beneficiary must meet all of the requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification by the priority date of the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). See *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977); see also *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

¹ Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), grants 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. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), grants preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

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 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1).

In evaluating the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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.

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered position has the following minimum requirements:

EDUCATION

Grade School: [Left blank]

High School: [Left blank]

College: [Left blank]

College Degree Required: [Left blank]

Major Field of Study: [Left blank]

TRAINING: None Required.

EXPERIENCE: Two (2) years in the job offered

OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: None.

The labor certification also states that the beneficiary qualifies for the offered position based on experience as an assistant manager with [redacted] in Austin, Texas from August 1996 until April 2000; and as an assistant manager with [redacted] in Austin, Texas from April 2000 to “present.” The beneficiary’s employment with [redacted] was added to the labor certification and initialed by the beneficiary on September 22, 2004, so it appears the beneficiary was still employed with [redacted] on September 22, 2004. No other experience is listed. The beneficiary signed the labor certification under a declaration that the contents are true and correct under penalty of perjury.

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

Any requirements of training or experience for skilled workers, professionals, or other workers must be supported by letters from trainers or employers giving the name, address, and title of the trainer or employer, and a description of the training received or the experience of the alien.

The record contains an experience letter from [REDACTED] partner, [REDACTED] stating that the company employed the beneficiary as an assistant manager from August 1, 1996 until April 15, 2000; and a letter from [REDACTED] president, [REDACTED] stating that the company employed the beneficiary as an assistant manager from April 15, 2000 to April 27, 2001. Neither of these letters are on company letterhead and the letters are almost identical to each other with regard to the duties allegedly performed by the beneficiary.

The record also contains a Form G-325 signed by the beneficiary on October 21, 2002 certifying the truth of the statements, under penalty of perjury. 28 U.S.C. § 1746. In the section asking the applicant's employment during the past five years, the beneficiary annotated "N/A."

The director's decision concluded that the petition contained fraudulent statements pertaining to the beneficiary's claimed employment and marital history. The decision states that it is based on facts set forth in a memorandum from USCIS Texas Service Center, Office of Fraud and National Security.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(i) states:

(i) Derogatory information unknown to petitioner or applicant. If the decision will be adverse to the applicant or petitioner and is based on derogatory information considered by the Service and of which the applicant or petitioner is unaware, he/she shall be advised of this fact and offered an opportunity to rebut the information and present information in his/her own behalf before the decision is rendered, except as provided in paragraphs (b)(16)(ii), (iii), and (iv) of this section. Any explanation, rebuttal, or information presented by or in behalf of the applicant or petitioner shall be included in the record of proceeding.

In this case, the record contained derogatory evidence of which the petitioner was unaware. The director did not provide the petitioner with notice of the derogatory evidence prior to issuing the decision.³ Therefore, the director's decision is withdrawn and remanded. In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(i), the director shall issue a notice of the derogatory information and consider any explanation, rebuttal, or information submitted by the petitioner in response.

³ USCIS is not required to provide a copy of the memorandum containing derogatory evidence. A summary of the derogatory information may be sufficient. *See Ghaly v. I.N.S.*, 48 F.3d 1426 (7th Cir. 1995).

Also, beyond the decision of the director,⁴ it appears a *bona fide* job opportunity open to U.S. workers did not exist at the time the petitioner filed the labor certification. A relationship invalidating a *bona fide* job offer may arise where the beneficiary is related to the petitioner by “blood” or it may “be financial, by marriage, or through friendship.” See *Matter of Sunmart 374*, 00-INA-93 (BALCA May 15, 2000). See section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C), regarding misrepresentation, “(i) in general – any alien, who by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks (or has sought to procure, or who has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission to the United States or other benefit provided under the Act is inadmissible.”

Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant, 19 I&N Dec. 401 (Comm’r 1986), discussed a beneficiary’s 50% ownership of the petitioning entity. The decision quoted an advisory opinion from the Chief of DOL’s Division of Foreign Labor Certification as follows:

The regulations require a ‘job opportunity’ to be ‘clearly open.’ Requiring the job opportunity to be *bona fide* adds no substance to the regulations, but simply clarifies that the job must truly exist and not merely exist on paper. The administrative interpretation thus advances the purpose of regulation 656.20(c)(8). Likewise requiring the job opportunity to be *bona fide* clarifies that a true opening must exist, and not merely the functional equivalent of self-employment. Thus, the administrative construction advances the purpose of regulations 656.20.

Id. at 405. Accordingly, a relationship invalidating a *bona fide* job offer may also arise where the beneficiary is related to the petitioner by “blood” or it may “be financial, by marriage, or through friendship.” See *Matter of Sunmart 374*, 2000-INA-93 (BALCA May 15, 2000).

The petitioner has the burden of establishing that a *bona fide* job opportunity exists when asked to show that the job opportunity is clearly open to U.S. workers. See *Matter of Amger Corp.*, 87-INA-545 (BALCA 1987); see also 8 U.S.C. § 1361.

The record contains documentation signed by [REDACTED] which states that the beneficiary’s husband, [REDACTED] and the petitioner’s president, [REDACTED] are brothers. The marriage certificate in the record shows the beneficiary and [REDACTED] were married prior to the priority date of the petition. Therefore, it appears a *bona fide* job offer did not exist at the time the petitioner filed the labor certification on April 30, 2001.

In view of the foregoing, the previous decision of the director will be withdrawn. The petition is remanded to the director for consideration of the issues stated above. The director may request any

⁴ 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).

additional evidence considered pertinent. Similarly, the petitioner may provide additional evidence within a reasonable period of time to be determined by the director. Upon receipt of all the evidence, the director will review the entire record and enter a new decision.

ORDER: The director's decision is withdrawn; however, the petition is currently not approvable for the reasons discussed above, and therefore the AAO may not approve the petition at this time. Because the petition is not approvable, the petition is remanded to the director for issuance of a new, detailed decision which, if adverse to the petitioner, is to be certified to the AAO for review.