



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)

[Redacted]

DATE: **APR 03 2014** OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER [Redacted]

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:


[Redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

  
Ron Rosenberg  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Texas 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. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a kitchen supervisor. 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 petitioner had not established 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 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 December 11, 2013 denial, the single issue in this case is whether or not the petitioner has established 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.

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 October 21, 2013. Part 2 of the Form I-140 provides nine options for the petitioner to elect the petition type. The petitioner checked box 1.f indicating that it was filing the petition for 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 appeal, counsel asserts that “nowhere in the I-140 application did petitioner indicate that it sought classification as a skilled worker” and that United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) should have considered the requirements of the labor

---

<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).

certification or otherwise sent a request for evidence to clarify the petitioner's intention as to the requested category.

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 there is no education or training required for the position and that the position requires 12 months of experience for the proffered position. Counsel states on appeal that no indication was made on the Form I-140 that the petitioner was filing a skilled worker petition, however, box 1.f on the Form I-140 has a check mark next to it, indicating that the petition was filed under the skilled worker classification. Box 1.g on the Form I-140, "any other worker (requiring less than 2 years of training or experience)," does not have such a check mark. In addition, the petition could not have been accepted by USCIS without a request for a particular classification. Without any request for classification in Part 2 of the Form I-140, the petition would have been rejected before consideration by the director.<sup>2</sup> There is no provision in statute or regulation that compels 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.

In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>2</sup> The record includes a Rejection Notice dated October 2, 2013 and issued to the petitioner. The notice states that the Form I-140 filed on behalf of the instant beneficiary was being returned because the application/petition type was not fully completed. Specifically, the notice states that the field "Part 2 Petition Type" was incomplete. The notice requests that the petitioner fully and properly complete the Form I-140 before resubmitting.