

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

D,




FILE: WAC 06 242 54780 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JAN 04 2008

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The director of the service center 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 a retail business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a database administrator. The petitioner, therefore, 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.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) responses to the director's request from counsel and the petitioner; (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 reaching its decision.

The issue before the AAO is whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the job it is offering to the beneficiary meets the following statutory and regulatory requirements.

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:

An 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:

- (I) 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) consistently interprets the term “degree” in the above criteria 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 petitioner seeks the beneficiary’s services as a database administrator. Evidence of the beneficiary’s duties includes: the petitioner’s July 25, 2006 letter in support of the petition and the petitioner’s December 11, 2006 response to the director’s RFE. As stated by the petitioner, the proposed duties and percentage of time spent on each duty are as follows:

- Analysis of requirements – 10%;
- Technical feasibility evaluation – 10%;
- Database applications design and development (using computer languages, databases, tools, and graphical user interfaces) – 25%;
- Databases and other software applications implementation and testing – 25%;
- Provide technical support for end-users – 10%;
- Provide administrative support for the computer network – 5%; and

- Database applications and other software applications maintenance – 15%.

The director found that the proposed database administrator duties do not require a bachelor's degree. Citing the Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, 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 concluded 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, in part, that the proffered database administrator position qualifies as a specialty occupation based on the first and fourth criteria of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Counsel states that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position, and that 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. As supporting documentation, counsel submits the following: the petitioner's advertising materials; copies of the petitioner's certificate of incorporation and Form SS-4, Application for Employer Identification Number; copies of the petitioner's 2005 federal income tax return and quarterly federal tax returns for 2006; a letter and financial documents from the petitioner's CPA; 2006 W-2 forms for the petitioner's employees; photographs of the petitioner's premises; and excerpts from various publications.

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. Minn. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The AAO does not find that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. A review of the Computer Scientists and Database Administrators occupation category in the *Handbook*, 2006-07 edition, finds a discussion of the training requirements for various computer positions including database administrators. The DOL states, in part: "Most community colleges and many independent technical institutes and proprietary schools offer an associate's degree in computer science or a related information technology field. Many of these programs may be more geared toward meeting the needs of local businesses and are more occupation specific than are 4-year programs." The *Handbook* does not report that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a database administrator job. In this case, the petitioner has not provided a definitive statement of duties associated with the proposed position that substantiates that the incumbent in

the position must possess a bachelor's degree in a specific discipline. The petitioner's 2005 federal income tax return reflects \$2,138,657 in gross receipts or sales, no compensation of officers, and \$109,100 paid in salaries and wages. Counsel's statement that the petitioner consists of five individual stores, currently has 34 employees, and is planning to expand its operations further by opening multiple new locations in other cities by the end of the year, is noted. A review of the W-2 forms submitted on appeal finds that the 2006 average annual wage of each of the petitioner's 34 employees was approximately \$3,724. Of further note, the record contains no evidence that current expansion plans are underway or about the specific requirements of those plans. Upon review of the record in its entirety, the petitioner has not established that it will hire a database administrator in a position that requires a four-year degree. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Accordingly, the petitioner has not established the proffered position as a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(iii)(A)(1).

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, counsel submits information from *America's Career InfoNet*. The *America's Career InfoNet* "Fastest-Growing Occupations" is not based upon the statutory and regulatory criteria for specialty occupations that govern this proceeding. Furthermore, this document does not specify a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty for any of the listed occupations. Accordingly, the fact that a "bachelor's degree or higher" is described as a requirement for database administrators in the State of New York is not probative.

In the alternative, the petitioner may show that the proffered position is so complex or unique that only an individual with a degree can perform the work associated with the position. In the instant petition, the petitioner has submitted insufficient documentation to distinguish the proffered position from similar but non-degreed employment. The petitioner has failed to establish the proffered position as a specialty occupation under either prong of the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(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. As counsel does not address this issue on appeal, it will not be discussed further. The evidence of record does not establish this criterion.

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(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.

Counsel states, on appeal, that the nature of the proposed duties "demands academic and practical knowledge and skills on the professional level." The petitioner, however, has not established that they exceed in scope, specialization, or complexity those usually performed by database administrators, an occupational category that does not require a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty. Further, as indicated earlier in this

decision, the petitioner's unsupported claims regarding future expansion of its business do not establish a requirement for the level of knowledge requisite for this criterion.

As related in the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

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 appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.