B6

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

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

[redacted]

File: WAC 00 102 54373 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 29 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary: [redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to § 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

Ellen E. Crawford for

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a computer wholesale company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently as a quality control engineer. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification approved by the Department of Labor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary met the petitioner's qualifications for the position as stated in the labor certification.

On appeal, counsel requests ninety days in which to submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO. To date, however, no further documentation has been received. Therefore, a decision will be made based on the record as it is presently constituted.

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 or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and who are members of the professions.

A labor certification is an integral part of this petition, but the issuance of a labor certification does not mandate the approval of the relating petition. To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the training, education, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's filing date. Matter of Wing's Tea House, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the petition's filing date is September 24, 1996.

The Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750) indicated that the position of Quality Control Engineer required a Bachelor of Science degree or equivalent in computer science, and two years of experience in the job offered or two years of experience in an equivalent related occupation.

The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had the required Bachelor's degree and denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel merely states that "[w]e believe the law was inappropriately applied and the decision was inconsistent with the information provided."

The record contains an educational evaluation from the Foundation for International Services, Inc., which states that the beneficiary has the equivalent of three years toward a bachelor's degree offered by an accredited university in the United States.

The three year experience for one year of education rule used in the evaluation is applicable to nonimmigrant H1B petitions, not immigrant petitions. The beneficiary is required to have a bachelor's degree on the Form ETA 750. The petitioner's actual minimum requirements could have been clarified or changed before the ETA 750 was certified by the Department of Labor. Since that was not done, the director's decision to deny the petition must be affirmed.

The issue here is whether the beneficiary met all of the requirements stated by the petitioner in block #14 of the labor certification as of the day it was filed with the Department of Labor. The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary had a bachelor of science degree in computer science on September 24, 1996. Therefore, the petition may not be approved.

It is noted that the petitioner has not established that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner submitted evidence of the ability to pay the wage in 1998 and 1999, however, the petitioner has not established the ability to pay the wage offered as of the filing date of the petition. As the appeal will be dismissed on the grounds discussed, this issue need not be examined further.

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 sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.