

PUBLIC COPY


DI

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**




FILE: LIN 01 252 53776 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: FEB 04 2004

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:




PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) summarily dismissed a subsequent appeal. The matter is again before the AAO on a motion to reopen or reconsider. The motion will be granted. The director's decision shall be affirmed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is a nursing and rehabilitation center that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a logistics and equipment supervisor. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 (a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition because the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184 (i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must meet one of the following criteria:

- (1) A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
- (2) The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
- (3) The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
- (4) The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) interprets the term "degree" in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; (5) Form I-290B; (6) the AAO's summary dismissal of the appeal; and (7) the petitioner's motion to reconsider. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a logistics and equipment supervisor. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; counsel's August 27, 2001 letter in support of the petition; a job description for the proffered position; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to this evidence, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail: requisitioning and purchasing all materials, equipment and supplies; monitoring supplier's performance and market trends; maintaining sufficient inventory; receiving, releasing, returning, and recording medical materials or supplies based on official requisitions; monitoring performance of medical equipment; submitting timely reports; recruiting, training, evaluating, and motivating staff; and creating and reviewing policies, job descriptions, and the procedural manual. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in engineering, administration, health care, or a related field.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the job is primarily that of a purchasing manager with inventory control and equipment maintenance duties. Citing to the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, 2002-2003 edition, the director noted that the minimum requirement for entry into the position was not a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. The director found further that the petitioner failed to establish any of the criteria found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

On appeal, counsel states that the proffered position is that of a logistics and equipment supervisor, and is not a purchasing manager. Counsel further states that the position requires a baccalaureate degree in engineering or a related field. According to counsel, the proffered position qualifies under all of the criteria found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Counsel states that the proposed duties, which include monitoring the maintenance, performance, and service of all medical equipment, are more extensive and complex than the duties associated with a purchasing manager position.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has established none of the four criteria outlined in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Therefore, the proffered position is not a specialty occupation.

The AAO turns first to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2 (h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2): a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position; a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations; or a particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree.

Factors often considered by CIS when determining these criteria include: whether the *Handbook* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." See *Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1165 (D.Min. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Slattery*, 764 F. Supp. 872, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. A review of the Purchasing Managers, Buyers, and Purchasing Agents job description in the *Handbook* confirms the accuracy of the director's assessment to the effect that, the job duties parallel those responsibilities of a purchasing manager, with inventory control and equipment maintenance duties. It is further noted that some of the proposed duties also parallel those responsibilities of an office and administrative support manager. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a purchasing manager or an office and administrative support manager.

Counsel's comments regarding the type of credentials required for the proffered position in the petitioner's industry are without merit. Counsel's personal observations do not constitute evidence in these proceedings. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The record contains no evidence regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry nor does the record include any evidence from professional associations regarding an industry standard, or documentation to support the complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position. The petitioner has, thus, not established the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) or (2).

The AAO now turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) – the employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position. The record indicates that the person who previously filled the proffered position held a baccalaureate degree in nursing. As such, the record does not demonstrate that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty such as mechanical engineering is required. Furthermore, CIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation, regardless of the petitioner's past hiring practices. *Cf. Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). The critical element is not the title of the position or an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.¹ In this regard, the petitioner fails to establish that the position it is offering to the beneficiary entails the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge.

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(iii)(A)(4) – the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

To the extent that they are depicted in the record, the duties do not appear so specialized and complex as to require the highly specialized knowledge associated with a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty. Therefore, the evidence does not establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

As related in the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

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 decision of the director is affirmed. The petition is denied.

¹ The court in *Defensor v. Meissner* observed that the four criteria at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) present certain ambiguities when compared to the statutory definition, and "might also be read as merely an additional requirement that a position must meet, in addition to the statutory and regulatory definition." *See id.* at 387.