




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)



DATE: OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER


FILE:

JAN - 4 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.

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,

*Elizabeth McCormack*

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the preference visa petition. The subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and reconsider. The motion will be granted, the previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed, and the petition will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a frozen food wholesaler. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a stock clerk. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a labor certification application approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. The director determined that the petitioner failed to submit all of the documents required with its initial submission. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The motion to reopen qualifies for consideration under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) because the petitioner is providing new facts with supporting documentation not previously submitted.

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, the AAO determined that the petitioner had not established its ability to pay the proffered wage and also determined 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. The AAO dismissed the appeal accordingly.

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)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(iii), provides for the granting of preference classification to other qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

Here, the Form I-140 was filed on February 19, 2008. On Part 2.e. of the Form I-140, the petitioner indicated that it was filing the petition for a professional or a skilled worker.

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.<sup>1</sup> On motion, counsel submits a brief and the evidence mentioned

---

<sup>1</sup> The submission of additional evidence on motion 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

above. On motion, counsel and the petitioner assert that the petitioner made a typographical error on Form I-140 and that the petitioner intended to check Part 2.g. indicating that it was filing the petition for an unskilled worker.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l) provides in pertinent part:

(4) Differentiating between skilled and other workers. The determination of whether a worker is a skilled or other worker will be based on the requirements of training and/or experience placed on the job by the prospective employer, as certified by the Department of Labor.

In this case, the labor certification indicates that the position requires only 6 month of experience, reference letters, the ability to work nights, and the ability to work in -20 degrees. However, the petitioner requested the skilled worker classification on the Form I-140. There is no provision in statute or regulation that compels United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to readjudicate a petition under a different visa classification in response to a petitioner's request to change it, once the decision has been rendered. 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 evidence submitted does not establish that the petition requires at least two years of training or experience such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker.

On motion, the petitioner submitted a client service agreement between [REDACTED] and itself, an addendum to professional services agreement between [REDACTED] and the petitioner, a billing and receipt history for the petitioner from [REDACTED] a certificate of incorporation for the petitioner indicating that it filed for incorporation on December 22, 1947, and entity information from the New York State Department of State Division of Corporations. The AAO notes that the petitioner did not submit its entire professional services agreement with [REDACTED] and only submitted the addendum.

Although the petitioner submitted some evidence of its agreements with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] it does not establish that the petition requires at least two years of training or experience such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a skilled worker. As the petition will be denied for this reason, the AAO will not analyze whether the petitioner has established on motion its ability to pay.

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 motion to reopen is granted and the decision of the AAO dated February 9, 2012 is affirmed. The petition remains denied.

---

newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).