


(b)(6)




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services




DATE: **MAR 15 2013** OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE: 

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii)

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, denied the preference visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a restaurant/food service. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an accountant. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by labor certification application approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the labor certification does not support the classification sought. The director denied the petition accordingly.

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.

As set forth in the director's October 19, 2010 denial, the issue in this case is whether or not the petitioner has established that the petition requires at least a baccalaureate degree such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a professional.

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 are members of the professions. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), also 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.

Here, the Form I-140 was filed on June 25, 2010. On Part 2.e. of the Form I-140, the petitioner indicated that it was filing the petition for a professional.

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 appeal, counsel submits a copy of the labor certification, an undated O\*Net occupation statement, the beneficiary's diploma, mark sheets and resume and a credential evaluation. On appeal, counsel asserts that the labor certification supports the professional classification sought. Counsel explains that the fact that the petitioner will accept a person with an Associate's degree and two years of experience is irrelevant because the focus of the inquiry is whether the beneficiary meets the minimum requirements for the position.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

In the director's decision, the director found that the labor certification did not support the classification sought because the ETA Form 9089 revealed that the petitioner would accept a worker with less than a baccalaureate degree. On Part H.8.A-C, petitioner indicated it would accept alternate education and experience to include a worker with an Associate's degree and two years of experience.<sup>2</sup>

In this case, the labor certification indicates that the petitioner would accept a Bachelor's degree in Finance, Economics and Management plus twelve months of experience, or, in the alternative, an Associate's degree plus two years of experience. However, the petitioner requested the professional 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* a baccalaureate degree in both the petitioner's primary and alternate education requirements such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a professional. As the alternate education and experience allows for an Associate's degree and two years of experience, the petitioner's minimum requirements are less than a Bachelor's degree.

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.

In this case, the labor certification indicates that, in lieu of a Bachelor's degree (and one year of experience), the beneficiary may possess the alternative education (and experience) of an Associate's degree (and two years of experience) to qualify for the proffered position. Thus, the minimum level of education of an Associate's degree, less than a Bachelor's degree, is required in

---

<sup>2</sup> Subsequent to the director's October 19, 2010 decision, the petitioner filed a second I-140 petition on December 20, 2011, with a different labor certification and different educational requirements seeking to "amend" the previously filed petition. A petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing. See *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 2&N Dec. 45, 49 (Cornrn. 1971). 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. 1988).

order for the beneficiary to qualify for the proffered position. However, the petitioner requested the professional 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 the minimum of a baccalaureate degree as the alternate education allows qualification based on an Associate's degree.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has also not established that the beneficiary is qualified for the offered position. The petitioner must establish that the beneficiary possessed all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the priority date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). See *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); see also *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971). 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 v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1981). Further, 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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).

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

(b)(6)

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: either one year of experience in the job offered (with a Bachelor's degree) as an accountant or two years of experience (with an Associate's degree), with the following specific skills listed in H.14.: ability to work with people from differing backgrounds, and effective communication with people of Indian ethnicity beneficial.

The beneficiary lists her prior experience as: (1) an accountant with the petitioner from February 25, 2008 to December 10, 2010, and (2) an accountant with another company from September 1, 2006 to December 31, 2007. These are the only positions listed.<sup>3</sup> The beneficiary signed the labor certification under a declaration that the contents are true and correct under penalty of perjury.

The beneficiary's claimed qualifying experience must be supported by letters from employers giving the name, address, and title of the employer, and a description of the beneficiary's experience. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(A). Yet, the record of proceeding does not contain any experience letters to support the experience listed on ETA Form 9089.<sup>4</sup> The non-existence or other unavailability of required evidence creates a presumption of ineligibility. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(2)(i).

---

<sup>3</sup> The AAO notes that while the ETA Form 9089, Part K, requires inclusion of any experience that qualifies the alien for the job opportunity, two additional accounting positions beneficiary lists on her resume are not similarly listed on the ETA Form 9089. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

<sup>4</sup> As part of the second I-140 filing, the petitioner submitted an experience letter showing that the petitioner employed the beneficiary. Representations made on the certified ETA Form 9089, which is signed by both the petitioner and the beneficiary under penalty of perjury, indicate that the beneficiary's experience with the petitioner cannot be used to qualify the beneficiary for the certified position. 20 C.F.R. § 656.17 states:

(h) *Job duties and requirements.* (1) The job opportunity's requirements, unless adequately documented as arising from business necessity, must be those normally required for the occupation

.....

(3) If the alien beneficiary already is employed by the employer, in considering whether the job requirements represent the employer's actual minimums, DOL will review the training and experience possessed by the alien beneficiary at the time of hiring by the employer, including as a contract employee. The employer can not

(b)(6)

The evidence in the record does not establish that the beneficiary possessed the required experience set forth on the labor certification by the priority date. Therefore, the petitioner has also failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified for the offered position.

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, petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

require domestic worker applicants to possess training and/or experience beyond what the alien possessed at the time of hire unless:

- (i) The alien gained the experience while working for the employer, including as a contract employee, in a position not substantially comparable to the position for which certification is being sought, or
- (ii) The employer can demonstrate that it is no longer feasible to train a worker to qualify for the position.

.....

(5) For purposes of this paragraph (i):

- (i) The term "employer" means an entity with the same Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN), provided it meets the definition of an employer at § 656.3.
- (ii) A "substantially comparable" job or position means a job or position requiring performance of the same job duties more than 50 percent of the time. This requirement can be documented by furnishing position descriptions, the percentage of time spent on the various duties, organization charts, and payroll records.