B6

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

[redacted]

File: [redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: 11 JAN 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary: [redacted]

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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:
This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Helen E Crawford for

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was revoked by the Director, Vermont Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Associate Commissioner, Examinations. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner on a motion to reopen. The motion will be granted, the previous decisions of the director and the Associate Commissioner will be affirmed and the petition will be denied.

The petitioner is a company involved in import and export. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an import clerk. As required by statute, the petition was accompanied by certification from the Department of Labor. The director determined that the proffered position is not one requiring the services of a skilled worker. The Associate Commissioner affirmed the director's decision to deny the petition.

On motion, counsel submits a statement and additional evidence.

Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3), 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 or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

8 C.F.R. 204.5(l)(3) states, in pertinent part:

> (ii) *Other documentation* -- (A) *General.* 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.
>
> (B) *Skilled workers.* If the petition is for a skilled worker, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification, meets the requirements for Schedule A designation, or meets the requirements for the Labor Market Information Pilot Program occupational designation. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

On motion, counsel reiterates his argument that:

> The decision which petitioner seeks to have reconsidered states that it is the job offer which must determine

> whether a position requires training or experience. The proffered expert affidavit unequivocally states that a job which requires a Russian/English bilingual employee inherently requires a person who possesses training and experience. This requirement of a bilingual worker is contained in the offer of employment. A position which requires that the successful candidate be fully bilingual in Russian and English certainly requires the services of a skilled worker.

As stated, however, by the Associate Commissioner in his decision:

> The determination of whether a worker is a skilled worker 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. 8 C.F.R. 204.5(l)(4). Based on the above-cited regulations governing classification as a skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, the proffered position is not one which requires the services of a skilled worker.

Upon review, the petitioner has been unable to present sufficient evidence to overcome the findings of the director in his decision to revoke the approval of the petition. The petitioner has not established eligibility pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Act and the petition may not be approved.

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 Associate Commissioner's decision of April 10, 2000 is affirmed. The petition is denied.