U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 43582844

Date: AUG. 11, 2026

Appeal of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Decision

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

The Petitioner, a software developer, 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.

USCIS denied the petition, concluding that the record did not establish that the Petitioner had a major, internationally recognized award, nor did it demonstrate that he met at least three of the ten regulatory criteria listed at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i) – (x). The matter is now before us on appeal pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

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). We review the questions in this matter de novo. *Matter of Christo's, Inc.*, 26 I&N Dec. 537, 537 n.2 (AAO 2015). Upon de novo review, we will withdraw USCIS' decision and remand the matter for entry of a new decision consistent with the following analysis.

Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act makes visas available to immigrants with extraordinary ability if:

(i) the alien has extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in the field through extensive documentation,

(ii) the alien seeks to enter the United States to continue work in the area of extraordinary ability, and

(iii) the alien's entry into the United States will substantially benefit prospectively the United States.

The term "extraordinary ability" refers only to those individuals in "that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2). The implementing regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) sets forth two options for satisfying this classification's initial evidence requirements. First, a petitioner can demonstrate a one-time achievement (that is, a major, internationally recognized award). If that petitioner does not submit this evidence, then he or she must provide documentation that meets at least three of the ten categories listed at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i) – (x) (including items such as awards, published material in certain media, and scholarly articles). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(4) allows a petitioner to submit comparable material if he or she is able to demonstrate that the standards at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i)-(x) do not readily apply to the individual's occupation.

Where a petitioner meets these initial evidence requirements, we then consider the totality of the material provided in a final merits determination and assess whether the record shows sustained national or international acclaim and demonstrates that the individual is among the small percentage at the very top of the field of endeavor. *See Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2010) (discussing a two-part review where the documentation is first counted and then, if fulfilling the required number of criteria, considered in the context of a final merits determination); *see also Visinscaia v. Beers*, 4 F. Supp. 3d 126, 131-32 (D.D.C. 2013); *Rijal v. USCIS*, 772 F. Supp. 2d 1339 (W.D. Wash. 2011). This two-step analysis is consistent with our holding that the "truth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality," as well as the principle that we examine "each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true." *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. at 376.

The Petitioner plans to continue to work in the field of cloud computing and microservice architecture. Because the Petitioner has not indicated or established that he received a major, internationally recognized award, he must establish at least three of the alternate regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i)-(x). The Petitioner initially claimed four criteria relating to awards, judging, original contributions, and leading or critical role. USCIS determined he satisfied three of the four criteria and proceeded to do a final merits determination. USCIS concluded that the Petitioner did not establish that he has sustained national or international acclaim and is among the small percentage at the very top of his field.

On appeal, the Petitioner contends USCIS mischaracterized his work and repeatedly relied on factors he did not claim to deny his petition. He asserts that these fundamental errors "influenced the overall direction of the adjudication and the final decision reached." He also maintains that the evidence was sufficient to demonstrate his eligibility for the requested classification.

Upon review, we observe that USCIS incorrectly stated that the Petitioner "intends to work as a Scientific Researcher in the field of microbiology, soil, and water conservation" and that he has "distinguished himself as a Statistical Programming/Researcher." In addition, USCIS stated that the Petitioner "presented evidence that he published scholarly articles" but the Petitioner did not provide such evidence and did not claim the criterion relating to scholarly articles. We therefore agree with the Petitioner that USCIS' decision contains sufficient errors to warrant a remand.

Here, USCIS' errors deprived the Petitioner of a fair opportunity to appeal the denial and inhibit our ability to meaningfully review the denial on appeal. An officer must fully explain the reasons for denying a visa petition to allow the Petitioner a fair opportunity to contest the decision and to allow us an opportunity for meaningful appellate review. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(i); *see also Matter of M-P-*, 20 I&N Dec. 786 (BIA 1994) (finding that a decision must fully explain the reasons for denying a motion to allow the respondent a meaningful opportunity to challenge the determination on appeal). Therefore, we will withdraw the decision based on this deficiency. On remand, USCIS should review the entire record and determine the Petitioner's eligibility under the two-step analysis. USCIS may request any additional evidence considered pertinent to the new determination. As such, we express no opinion regarding the ultimate resolution of this case on remand.

ORDER: The decision is withdrawn. The matter is remanded for the entry of a new decision consistent with the foregoing analysis.