

(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: **MAY 08 2013**

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

[REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other, Unskilled Worker Pursuant to § 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

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 read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The approval of the preference visa petition was revoked by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The petitioner is a pool manufacturer. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a set up person as an unskilled worker pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3). As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). As set forth in the director's October 21, 2011 revocation, the primary issues in this case are whether the petitioner willfully misrepresented the beneficiary's work history on the Form ETA 750 and whether the petitioner will employ the beneficiary in the offered position.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

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.

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 April 30, 2001, which is the date the labor certification was accepted for processing by the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140) was filed on April 30, 2007.

Upon review of the entire record, including evidence submitted on appeal and in response to a Notice of Derogatory Information and Request for Evidence issued by the AAO, the AAO concludes that the petitioner has established that it is more likely than not that the beneficiary had all the education, training, and experience specified on the Form ETA 750 as of April 30, 2001. Further, it appears more likely than not that the petitioner and the beneficiary have not willfully misrepresented the beneficiary's work experience in order to gain an immigration benefit. Finally, it appears more likely than not that the petitioner will employ the beneficiary in the offered position.

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 met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained, and the petition is approved.