



DA

U.S. Department of Justice  
Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: WAC-99-225-51831 Office: California Service Center Date: **APR 04 2001**

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)

**Public Copy**

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: [Redacted]

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

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

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

**Identification data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.**

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

*Robert P. Wiemann*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a professional placement firm with ten employees and a gross annual income of \$425,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an accountant for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, the petitioner's CEO indicates that he is not submitting a separate brief or evidence and further states that:

1. The decision is "inconsistent" with the previous petitions we filed where our beneficiaries were granted H-1B Classification basing [sic] on their degree in Accounting and with the same job duties described in this case.

2. As Professional Staffing Service, all our clients specifically requires [sic] a worker with a Bachelor's degree to fill in their vacancies. The job duties described in this case were required by our client.

3. Our company meets one of the four criteria of title 8 of federal regulations part 214 2(H) (4) (iii) (A) where employer normally requires a degree for the specific position.

8 C.F.R. 214.2(h) (4) (ii) defines the term "specialty occupation" 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.

The director denied the petition because the duties described by the petitioner appeared to relate to the job of a bookkeeper or an accounting clerk. The director did not find the duties described by the petitioner to be indicative of a position that only encompasses accounting tasks.

Counsel's statement on appeal is not persuasive. The Service does not use a title, by itself, when determining whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation. The specific duties of the offered position combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations are factors that the Service considers. In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

COMPILES AND ANALYZES FINANCIAL INFORMATION TO PREPARE ENTRIES TO GENERAL LEDGER ACCOUNTS DOCUMENTING BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS. ANALYZES FINANCIAL INFORMATION DETAILING ASSETS, LIABILITIES AND CAPITAL. PREPARES BALANCE SHEETS AND PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENTS.

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.

The petitioner has not met any of the above requirements to classify the offered position as a specialty occupation.

First, the Service does not agree with counsel's argument that the beneficiary is a "corporate accountant," an occupation that would normally require a bachelor's degree in accounting or a related field. In its Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2000-2001 edition, at page 20, the Department of Labor (DOL) describes the job of a management accountant as follows:

Management accountants - also called industrial, corporate or private accountants - record and analyze the financial information for the companies for which they work. . . . They are usually part of executive teams involved in strategic planning or new product development. . . . They also prepare financial reports

for non-management groups, including stockholders, creditors, regulatory agencies, and tax authorities.

The record reflects that the petitioner, which is in the professional placement business, employs approximately ten persons and has a gross annual income of \$425,000. The business in which the beneficiary is to be employed does not require the services of a corporate accountant who is part of an executive decision-making team. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the position offered includes complex or advanced accounting duties such as the preparation of detailed financial reports for outside agencies or corporate stockholders, or that the position requires an individual with a knowledge of sophisticated accounting techniques normally associated with the duties of a corporate accountant.

The duties that the petitioner endeavors to have the beneficiary perform are financial transaction reporting duties, which are similar to the duties that a bookkeeper or accounting clerk would execute in a small business establishment. In contrast to the description of an accountant, at page 318 of the Handbook, the DOL describes the positions of a bookkeeper and accounting clerk as follows:

In small establishments, bookkeeping clerks handle all aspects of financial transactions. . . More advance accounting clerks may total, balance, and reconcile billing vouchers; ensure completeness and accuracy of data on accounts; and code documents according to company procedures.

The types of duties the petitioner ascribes to the beneficiary fall within the scope of a bookkeeping or accounting clerk position rather than a management accounting position. For example, the petitioner states that the beneficiary will "prepare entries to general ledger accounts." Bookkeeping and routine accounts receivable and payable transactions are not duties normally associated with a corporate accountant. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Second, the petitioner has not shown that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specialized area such as accounting, for the offered position. Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that businesses similar to the petitioner in their type of operations, number of employees, and amount of gross annual income, require the services of individuals in parallel positions. Finally, the petitioner did not demonstrate that the nature of the beneficiary's proposed duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. The job fits the description of a bookkeeper or accounting clerk, rather than an accountant. According to the DOL at page 318 of Handbook, the usual requirement for a bookkeeping or accounting clerk is a high school diploma or its equivalent. A higher level of training is favored but not required, and such training is available in community colleges or schools of business. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

With respect to the petitioner's objection to denial of this petition in view of the approval of similar petitions in the past, this Service is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated. The record of proceeding, as presently constituted, does not contain copies of the previously approved petitions and their supporting documentation. It is, therefore, not possible to determine definitively whether they were approved in error or whether the facts and conditions have changed since their approval.

Beyond the decision of the director, the record contains insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in a specialty occupation. The record indicates that the beneficiary holds a baccalaureate degree in commerce conferred by an institution in the Philippines. The record does not contain an evaluation of the beneficiary's credentials from a service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials as required by 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(2)(iii)(D)(3). As this matter will be dismissed on the grounds discussed, this issue need not be examined further.

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.