U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

**Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 36548599

Date: MAR. 12, 2025

Appeal of Nebraska Service Center Decision

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

The Petitioner is a Rabbi and a historian who 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.

The Nebraska Service Center Director denied the Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers (petition), concluding the record did not establish that the Petitioner had a major, internationally recognized award, nor did he demonstrate that he met at least three of the ten regulatory criteria. The matter is now before us on appeal under 8 C.F.R. § 103.3. The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) by a preponderance of the evidence. Section 291 of the Act; *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375 (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 dismiss the appeal.

## I. LAW

Section 203(b)(1) 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,
>
> the alien seeks to enter the United States to continue work in the area of extraordinary ability, and
>
> the alien's entry into the United States will substantially benefit prospectively the United States.

To qualify under this immigrant classification, the statute requires the filing party demonstrate:

- The alien enjoys extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics;
- They seek to enter the country to continue working in the area of extraordinary ability; and
- The alien's entry into the United States will substantially benefit the country in the future.

Section 203(b)(1)(A)(i)–(iii) of the Act. The term "extraordinary ability" refers only to those 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 a multi-step analysis. In the first step, a petitioner can demonstrate international recognition of his or her achievements in the field through 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 sufficient qualifying documentation that meets at least three of the ten criteria 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).

Where a petitioner meets these initial evidence requirements, we then move to the second step to 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, 1121 (9th Cir. 2010) (discussing a two-step 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 Amin v. Mayorkas*, 24 F.4th 383, 394 (5th Cir. 2022).

## II. ANALYSIS

### A. Evidentiary Criteria

Because the Petitioner has not indicated or established that he has received a major, internationally recognized award, he must satisfy at least three of the alternate regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i)–(x). Before the Director, the Petitioner claimed he met four of the regulatory criteria. The Director decided that the Petitioner did not satisfy any of the criteria. The Petitioner claimed eligibility through his prizes or awards, original contributions, authorship of scholarly articles, and his leading or critical role. On appeal, the Petitioner maintains that he meets those same evidentiary criteria. After reviewing all the evidence in the record, we conclude he has not satisfied any of the claimed criteria.

1. "Evidence of the alien's authorship of scholarly articles in the field, in professional or major trade publications or other major media." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vi).

The Petitioner claimed he published two books. The Director determined that the Petitioner did not meet the requirements of this criterion. The Director specifically noted the Petitioner failed to provide "evidence showing that he has published his books in professional or major trade publications or other major media. As such, he has not met the plain language of the criterion."

On appeal, the Petitioner claims the Director did not consider various factors that do not relate to this criterion's plain language requirements: that the published material appear "in professional or major

trade publications or other major media." As the Petitioner has not offered material that the regulation mandates, he has not satisfied this criterion.

2. "Documentation of the alien's receipt of lesser nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards for excellence in the field of endeavor." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i).

This criterion contains several evidentiary elements, all of which must be met to satisfy the regulation. According to the plain language of the regulation the evidence must establish: (1) the alien is the recipient of the prizes or the awards; (2) those accolades are nationally or internationally recognized; and (3) each prize or award is one for excellence in the field of endeavor.

The Petitioner provided a Rabbinical Certificate as evidence to support his claim here. The Director determined that the Petitioner did not meet the requirements of this criterion as the Petitioner did not offer documentary evidence or persuasive arguments to establish that educational certifications are prizes for excellence as considered by the regulation.

On appeal, the Petitioner does not address or rebut the Director's findings. Instead, he merely offers the same arguments he submitted before the Director. The reason for filing an appeal is to provide an affected party with the means to remedy what they perceive as an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact within a previous proceeding. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v). By presenting only a generalized statement of an error without explaining the specific aspects they consider to be incorrect, the affected party has failed to identify the basis for contesting this requirement on appeal. *Matter of Garcia*, 28 I&N Dec. 693, 693 (BIA 2023) (citing *Matter of R-A-M-*, 25 I&N Dec. 657, 658 n.2 (BIA 2012) and finding issues that are not meaningfully challenged in the appeal are waived); *see also Wong v. Garland*, 95 F.4th 82, 95 (2d Cir. 2024).

The Petitioner has not submitted evidence that meets the plain language requirements of this criterion.

3. We Reserve Any Remaining Appellate Claims

As of yet, the Petitioner has not demonstrated he has met any of the claimed criteria. While he argues and submits evidence for two additional criteria on appeal for his original contributions and performing in a leading or critical role, it is unnecessary that we make a decision on those additional grounds because he cannot numerically meet the required number of criteria. As the Petitioner cannot fulfill the initial evidentiary requirement of three criteria under 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3), we reserve the remaining issues. *Patel v. Garland*, 596 U.S. 328, 332 (2022) (citing *INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25–26 (1976) (finding agencies are not required to make "purely advisory findings" on issues that are unnecessary to the ultimate decision)); *see also Matter of Larios-Gutierrez De Pablo & Pablo-Larios*, 28 I&N Dec. 868, 877 n.8 (BIA 2024) (declining to reach alternative issues on appeal where an applicant is otherwise ineligible). It is also unnecessary that we provide the type of final merits determination referenced in *Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1119–20. Nevertheless, we advise that we have reviewed the record in the aggregate, concluding that it does not support a finding that the Petitioner has established the acclaim and recognition required for the classification sought.

## III. CONCLUSION

The Petitioner has not submitted the required initial evidence of either a one-time achievement or documents that meet at least three of the ten criteria. As a result, we do not need to provide the type of final merits determination referenced in *Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1119–20. Nevertheless, we advise that we have reviewed the record in the aggregate, concluding it does not support a finding that the Petitioner has established the acclaim and recognition required for the classification sought.

The Petitioner seeks a highly restrictive visa classification, intended for individuals already at the top of their respective fields, rather than for those progressing toward that goal. USCIS has long held that even athletes performing at the major league level do not automatically meet the "extraordinary ability" standard. *Matter of Price*, 20 I&N Dec. 953, 954 (Assoc. Comm'r 1994). Here, the Petitioner has not shown the significance of their work is indicative of the required sustained national or international acclaim or that it is consistent with a "career of acclaimed work in the field" as contemplated by Congress. H.R. Rep. No. 101-723, 59 (Sept. 19, 1990); *see also* section 203(b)(1)(A). Moreover, the record does not otherwise demonstrate that the Petitioner has garnered national or international acclaim in the field, and they are one of the small percentage who has risen to the very top of the field of endeavor. *See* section 203(b)(1)(A) and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2).

For the reasons discussed above, the Petitioner has not demonstrated his eligibility as an alien of extraordinary ability. The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternate basis for the decision.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.