

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

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

151



FILE: EAC 05 235 50813 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUL 02 2007

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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

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.

*for Michael T. Kelly*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is an accounting software developer and seeks to employ the beneficiary as an international sales representative. It 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 does not qualify as a specialty occupation, and because the beneficiary does not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief indicating that the offered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

The first issue to be discussed in this proceeding is whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), provides, in part, for the classification of qualified nonimmigrant aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation.

Section 214(i)(1) of 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.

The term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

[A]n occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a 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 are 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.

To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, CIS does not simply rely on a position’s title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity’s business operations, are factors to be considered. CIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). The critical element is not the title of the position nor 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.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the 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; and (5) the Form I-290B with counsel’s brief. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary’s services as an international sales representative. Evidence of the beneficiary’s duties includes the Form I-129 petition with attachment and the petitioner’s response to the director’s request for evidence. The duties to be performed by the beneficiary are described briefly in very generic and non-specific terms. According to this evidence the beneficiary would “help with the sales of retail point of sale accounting software in the [United States] as well as help with the formation and education of our sales strategy into Latin America and Asia.” The petitioner also indicates that while the beneficiary will not actually translate training manuals, he will oversee the progress of translation performed by translators/contractors.

The petitioner finds the beneficiary qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position by virtue of his master’s degree in civil engineering from Tufts University.

To determine whether the duties described are those of a specialty occupation, the AAO first considers 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; and 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 Department of Labor’s *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether an industry 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. Minn. 1999) (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

The petitioner described the duties of the offered position as that of a sales representative in the Form I-129 and in response to the director’s request for evidence. On appeal, counsel changes the nature of the duties to be performed by the beneficiary and states that the position is actually that of a technical writer. The director, in its request for evidence, requested a detailed job description. The petitioner did not provide the requested information and now sets forth on appeal a description of the duties of the proffered position that was not previously submitted into the record. CIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12). The purpose of a Request for Evidence (RFE) is to solicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8).

The petitioner was put on notice of required evidence and given a reasonable opportunity to provide it for the record before the visa petition was adjudicated. The petitioner failed to submit the requested evidence and now submits it on appeal. The AAO will not, however, now consider this evidence for any purpose. *Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988). The appeal will be adjudicated based on the record of proceeding before the director.

The AAO finds the petitioner’s description of the duties of its proffered position to reflect the type of activities generally performed by sales representatives. The occupation of sales representative is not normally deemed a specialty occupation. The *Handbook* notes that the background needed for sales jobs varies by product line and market. Many employers hire individuals with previous sales experience who lack a college degree, but increasingly prefer or require a bachelor’s degree because job requirements have become more technical and analytical. Nevertheless, for some consumer products, factors such as sales ability, personality, and familiarity with brands are more important than educational background. On the other hand, firms selling complex, technical products may require a technical degree in addition to some sales experience. The petitioner in this instance, however, has not presented a detailed description of the duties to be performed by the beneficiary in its business environment. The record does not contain a detailed description of the products to be sold by the beneficiary. Thus, neither the tasks to be performed by the beneficiary nor their complexity can be examined. Without this type of description, the AAO is unable to determine whether the responsibilities of the proffered position would require the beneficiary to hold the minimum of a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent to perform them. Accordingly, the record does not establish that the offered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under the first criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The AAO now turns to a consideration of whether the proffered position may qualify as a specialty occupation under either of the prongs of the second criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) – establish that a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, or that the proffered position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree. The petitioner has offered no evidence in this regard except for a brief non-specific description of the position’s duties. The AAO, therefore, concludes that the record before it does not establish that the position qualifies

as a specialty occupation under the second prong at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) – the position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree. It finds no evidence in the record that would support such a finding. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established its position as a specialty occupation under either prong of the second criterion.

The AAO now considers the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) and (4): the employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; and the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

To determine the petitioner's ability to meet the third criterion, the AAO normally reviews the petitioner's past employment practices, as well as the histories, including names and dates of employment, of those employees with degrees who previously held the position, and copies of those employee's diplomas. In response to the director's request for evidence, the petitioner lists the names of three present employees who reportedly hold degrees in psychology, biochemistry and physics. The record does not establish, however, that those individuals are actually presently employed by the petitioner, or have been in the past as no payroll records or similar documentation were submitted. Further, copies of diplomas were not provided. The petitioner has submitted no evidence regarding its past hiring practices with regard to the proffered position or other similarly-situated employees. Further, the evidence of record does not establish that the degree-requirement asserted by the petitioner is necessitated by the actual work that the beneficiary would perform. The petitioner's creation of a position with a perfunctory bachelor's degree requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5<sup>th</sup> 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. To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if CIS were limited to reviewing a petitioner's self-imposed employment requirements, then any alien with a bachelor's degree could be brought into the United States to perform a menial, non-professional, or an otherwise non-specialty occupation, so long as the employer required all such employees to have baccalaureate or higher degrees. *See id.* at 388. Accordingly, it cannot establish the offered position as a specialty occupation under the third criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). The petitioner's degree requirement for the proffered position is not evidence of its normal hiring practices.

The fourth criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) requires a petitioner to establish that the nature of the specific duties of the position is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree. The duties of the proffered position as described are too generic to determine what specific tasks would be performed by the beneficiary. The generic description of the duties of the proffered position discussed under the first criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) also makes it impossible to evaluate these duties under the specialized and complex threshold of the fourth criterion. Accordingly, the AAO concludes that the proffered position is not a specialty occupation under the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

The proffered position does not meet any of the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Accordingly, the director's denial of the I-129 petition shall not be disturbed.

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 failed to sustain that burden and the appeal shall accordingly be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.