U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 42131765

Date: APR. 15, 2026

Motion on Administrative Appeals Office Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers (Extraordinary Ability)

The Petitioner, a chief architect of digital transformations, seeks classification as an alien of extraordinary ability. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(1)(A), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A). This first preference classification makes immigrant visas available to those who can demonstrate their extraordinary ability through sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in their field through extensive documentation.

Service Center Operations (SCOPS) denied the petition, concluding that the Petitioner met only two initial evidentiary criteria, in which three must be satisfied. Specifically, SCOPS found the Petitioner fulfilled judging under 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv) and roles under 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(viii). On appeal, we determined the Petitioner met a third criterion relating to scholarly articles under 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vi). Therefore, we conducted a final merits determination but concluded the Petitioner did not demonstrate that he is among the small percentage at the very top of the field of endeavor. Accordingly, we dismissed the appeal. The matter is now before us on combined motions to reopen and reconsider.

The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). Upon review, we will dismiss the motions.

I. Analysis

A motion to reconsider must establish that our prior decision was based on an incorrect application of law or policy and that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence in the record of proceedings at the time of the decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3). A motion to reopen must state new facts and be supported by documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). Because the scope of a motion is limited to the prior decision, we will only review the latest decision in these proceedings. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i), (ii). We may grant motions that satisfy these requirements and demonstrate eligibility for the requested benefit.

The Petitioner argues that our final merits determination "discounted [his] apex Salesforce architecture credential (CTA/Architect Review Board)" and provides additional evidence regarding "the enormous

size and economic footprint of the Salesforce ecosystem" and "the rigorous, board-style nature of the CTA/Architecture Review Board process."

As indicated in our prior decision, the Petitioner presented evidence claiming that he is among 400 people who possess Salesforce CTA. The record, for instance, contains screenshots from salesforceen.com stating that "[l]aunched in 2011, the CTA certification is, according to Salesforce, the 'pinnacle' of certifications," and screenshots from freepressjournal.in stating that CTA "designation is considered one of the most challenging and prestigious certifications within the Salesforce ecosystem as it is designed for professionals with extensive experience in Salesforce architecture." On motion, the Petitioner references various figures from his evidence, such as "Salesforce and its ecosystem would create 9.3 million jobs and $1.6 trillion in new business revenues," and projects that "[i]f CTA holders are approximately 400-500 globally and the ecosystem jobs figures is 9,300,000, then the CTA cohort is approximately 0.004%-0.005% of that workforce base" and "[i]f CTA holders are approximately 400-500 and Trailhead learners are 7,400,000, then CTAs represent approximately 0.005%-0.007% of that learner base."

However, the Petitioner did not demonstrate the significance of this credential in establishing him among that small percentage at the very top of his field. Although he may be among 400 - 500 people who possess Salesforce CTA, the Petitioner did not offer relevant context, such as how many people even pursue the credential or how many people never make it through the certification process. Moreover, the fact that, according to the Petitioner's own figures, his Salesforce CTA represents 0.004% - 0.007% of the workforce does not necessarily indicate his standing in the field if recognition is limited within Salesforce, only applies to people who utilize Salesforce, or only a few apply for it, regardless of the review board process.

Furthermore, the record includes screenshots from cio.com regarding "Top 15 certifications for enterprise architects," in which Salesforce CTA is limited among them. However, the article does not indicate the prestigious nature of these certifications rather than "certifications are a great way to validate your enterprise architecture" and "one or more of these 15 certifications will help strengthen your resume." The Petitioner did not demonstrate that his Salesforce CTA places him among that very top of his field as opposed to being better qualified as an enterprise architect. In addition, the Petitioner did not show how his Salesforce CTA differentiates from the other 14 certifications or how he compares himself to other individuals in his field who are viewed among the upper echelon that have any of these certifications, including the Salesforce CTA.

Without additional information and further context, considering his Salesforce CTA both individually and collectively, the Petitioner did not demonstrate his sustained national or international acclaim. The alien has extraordinary ability that has been demonstrated through extensive documentation. Section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)(i). The intent of Congress that a very high standard be set for aliens of extraordinary ability is reflected in this regulation by requiring the petitioner to present more extensive documentation than that required for lesser classifications. 56 FR 30703-01, 30704. Here, the majority of the Petitioner's personal and professional accomplishments reflect events within one or two years of initially filing the petition. For example, the Petitioner's memberships (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, the British Computer Society, [redacted] and the Royal Society of Arts) occurred between 2023 – 2024; his press material ([redacted]) occurred in 2023; his judging experience

([redacted] occurred between 2023 – 2024; his authorships [redacted] occurred in 2024, and his salary was based on 2024 wages.

A petition for an alien of extraordinary ability must be accompanied by evidence that the alien has sustained national or international acclaim and that his or her achievements have been recognized in the field of expertise. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). In determining whether an individual has enjoyed "sustained" national or international acclaim, USCIS should consider that such acclaim must be maintained. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(A)(1), https://www.uscis.gov/policy-manual. According to *Black's Law Dictionary* (11th ed. 2019), the definition of sustain is "to support or maintain, especially over a long period of time . . . To persist in making (an effort) over a long period of time." *Id.* Although he received Salesforce CTA in 2020 and has worked at [redacted] from 2013 – 2021 and at [redacted] from 2024 – present, the Petitioner did not demonstrate that his relative short personal and professional achievements immediately preceding the filing of the petition represent a career of acclaimed work. An alien can qualify on the basis of a career of acclaimed work in the field. 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 6710, 6739.

Moreover, the Petitioner did show that he received any recognition for awards received by [redacted] *See Donskoy v. United States Citizenship & Immigr. Servs.*, No. 21-CV-04757-CRB, 2021 WL 5240224, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 11, 2021) (finding that what matters for the purpose of the visa classification is whether the award brought the petitioner individual acclaim). In addition, the Petitioner did not establish that he garnered any attention from his memberships or how they place him among that small percentage at the very top of the field. *See Hamal v. United States Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. 21-5160, 2023 WL 1156801, at *3 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 31, 2023) (finding although the petitioner's membership demonstrated his professional stature, it did not "establish the exceptional level of distinction" required for the extraordinary ability visa). Further, the Petitioner did not demonstrate that three recent articles about him shows his national or international acclaim or indicates his level among the upper echelon his field. *Bodhankar v. United States Citizenship & Immigr. Servs.*, No. 119CV706MADCFH, 2020 WL 777211, at *5 (N.D.N.Y. Feb. 18, 2020) (finding the lack of press about the plaintiff was not consistent with national or international acclaim).

Likewise, the Petitioner did not establish the significance of his recent judging instances. *See Agrawal v. Miller*, No. 4:24CV3143, 2025 WL 2879217, at *23 (D. Neb. Sept. 12, 2025) (upholding that plaintiff did not show how she judged to such an extent, or at a high enough level, that her judging surpasses the majority of the field and places her in the top echelon of the field). Furthermore, the Petitioner did not show that his work with [redacted] and [redacted] brought him a level attention by his field consistent with that small percentage at the very top of the field. *See Joseph v. Dir. of Texas Serv. Ctr., United States Citizenship & Immigr. Servs.*, No. 24-40249, 2025 WL 458001, at*4 (5th Cir. Feb. 11, 2025) (upholding plaintiff did not demonstrate his contributions reflected sustained national or international acclaim through extensive documentation).

Similarly, the Petitioner did not demonstrate the importance or value of his four recent authorships or that they received recognition at a level tantamount to the very top of the field. *See Bhanu v. Garland*, No. 22-103, 2023 WL 6119357, at *9 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 18, 2023) (upholding the Petitioner did not show the significance of authorships reflect that he is among the small percentage at the very top of the

field). Moreover, the Petitioner did not establish that his employment with [redacted] garnered him recognition as being among the upper tier in his field. *See Hamal*, 2021 WL 2338316, at *4, *aff'd*, 2023 WL 1156801 (upholding plaintiff did not contextualize his work at an organization demonstrating recognition by the field as being significantly important or viewed as unusually influential). In addition, the Petitioner did not show that his recent earnings indicate sustained acclaim or places him among the very top of his field. *See Jafarov v. United States Citizenship & Immigr. Servs.*, No. 23 CIV. 3372 (PAE), 2024 WL 69056, at *9 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 5, 2024) (finding the failure to command consistent high wage earnings did not reflect sustained national or international acclaim and a single year's, or even a few years', worth of salary data unlikely to satisfy this requirement).

The record as a whole, including the evidence discussed above, does not establish the Petitioner's eligibility for the benefit sought.[1] Here, the Petitioner seeks a highly restrictive visa classification, intended for individuals already at the top of their respective fields, rather than those progressing toward the top. *Matter of Price*, 20 I&N Dec. 953, 954 (Assoc. Comm'r 1994) (concluding that even major league level athletes do not automatically meet the statutory standards for classification as an individual of "extraordinary ability,"); *Amin v. Mayorkas*, 24 F.4th at 394 (stating that extraordinary ability is such an elite level of accomplishment); *Lapteva v. Schuurmans*, No. 8:24CV83, 2025 WL 815087, at *1 (D. Neb. Mar. 10, 2025) (stating that EB-1 visa are intended to be available to only an exceedingly small amount of individuals with extraordinary ability). In this case, the Petitioner has not shown the significance of his work is indicative of the required sustained national or international acclaim or it is consistent with a career of acclaimed work in the field. *See* Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act. While the Petitioner need not establish that there is no one more accomplished to qualify for the classification sought, the record is insufficient to demonstrate that he is among the small percentage at the top of his field. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2).

II. Conclusion

On motion, the Petitioner has not demonstrated that our previous decision was based on an incorrect application of law or policy at the time we issued our decision. Further, although he has submitted additional evidence in support of the motion, the Petitioner has not established eligibility. Therefore, the motion will be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

ORDER: The motion to reopen is dismissed.

FURTHER ORDER: The motion to reconsider is dismissed.

NOTICE: Aliens who are not lawfully present, or who are otherwise inadmissible or deportable, may be subject to the commencement of removal proceedings under section 240 of the Act through the issuance of a Form I-862, Notice to Appear. Those proceedings may result in their removal from the United States and possible ineligibility for future visas or other immigration benefits.

[1] *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual*, *supra*, at F.2(B)(2) (providing that some evidence weighs more favorably on its own, while other evidence is more persuasive when viewed with other evidence).