

identifying case deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

D1

FILE: EAC 01 210 50505 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: 6/1/01

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, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The service center director granted a subsequent motion to reopen and affirmed his previous decision. 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 supplier of home improvement products that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a computer programmer/analyst. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to § 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 statement and indicated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. As of this date, however, the AAO has not received any additional evidence into the record. Therefore, the record is complete.

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.

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) the petitioner's motion to reopen; (6) the director's decision affirming the denial of

the petition; and (7) Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a computer programmer/analyst. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's April 20, 2001 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to the petitioner's April 20, 2001 letter, the beneficiary would perform the following duties:

- Evaluates and modifies computer programs to determine feasibility, cost and time required;
- Analyzes, reviews and alters programs to increase operating efficiency or adapt to new requirements;
- Analyzes workflow chart and diagram, applying knowledge of computer capabilities, subject matter and symbolic logic;
- Reads manuals, periodicals, and technical reports to learn ways to develop programs that meet company requirements;
- Formulates plan outlining steps required to develop program, using structured analysis and design;
- Designs computer terminal screen displays to accomplish goals of user request;
- Enter commands into computer to run and test program;
- Reads computer printouts or observes display screen to detect syntax or logic errors during program test, or uses diagnostic software to detect errors;
- Recreates steps taken by user to locate source problem and rewrites program to correct errors, and assists users to solve operating problems; and
- Writes documentation to describe program development, logic, coding, and corrections.

The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in computer science or a related field.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because 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 position, which is that of a programmer/analyst, is so complex and specialized as to require a related baccalaureate degree.

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 Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (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 concur with counsel that the proffered position, which is primarily that of a computer programmer, is a specialty occupation. A review of the Computer Programmers job qualifications in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, finds that there are many training paths available for programmers, and that some programmers may qualify for certain jobs with an associate's degree or its equivalent. In this case, although information on the petition, which was signed by the petitioner's CFO on April 11, 2001, indicates that the petitioner has "45+" employees and a gross annual income of "25 millions+", the petitioner's CFO states in a letter, dated April 20, 2001, that the petitioner employs 70 individuals and its gross annual sales for the last fiscal year were in excess of \$105,000,000. The record, however, contains no explanation for these inconsistencies. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988).

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for various computer-related positions. There is no evidence, however, to show that the employers issuing those postings are similar to the petitioner, or that the advertised positions are parallel to the instant position. The petitioner has not demonstrated that the proposed duties of proffered position are as complex as those described in the advertised positions. Thus, the advertisements have no relevance.

The record also does not include any evidence from professional associations regarding an industry standard, or documentation to support the complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position. The petitioner, therefore, has 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. On appeal, counsel does not address this issue. It is noted, however, that the record contains credential evaluations for two of the petitioner's current employees engaged in computer-related activities. The evaluator concludes that, based on education and training, one of these employees possesses the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in business administration and marketing with an additional minor in computer science from an accredited U.S. technical college. The evaluator concludes that the other employee possesses the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in computer science from an accredited U.S. educational institute. However, the evaluation is based upon the beneficiary's education, training and work experience. A

credentials evaluation service may not evaluate an alien's work experience or training; it can only evaluate educational credentials. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(3). Thus, the evaluation carries no weight in these proceedings. *Matter of Sea, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 817 (Comm. 1988). It is also unclear whether the duties of these current employees are parallel to the proposed duties of the proffered position. In view of the foregoing, the petitioner has not established the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

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.

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 appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.