



DR

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



...ing data deleted to
... clearly unwarranted
... of personal privacy

File: LIN-00-106-51126

Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: DEC 21 2001

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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



Public Copy

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.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, 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 company which procures and distributes construction materials and metals with 190 employees and a gross annual income of \$1.5 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a marketing analyst for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation or that the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a statement. The petitioner also requests that it be provided with an extension of ninety days to submit additional evidence in support of the appeal. However, as of the date of this decision, the petitioner has failed to submit any additional evidence to supplement the appeal. Therefore, the record must be considered complete.

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), provides in part for nonimmigrant classification to qualified 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 a "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and 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 section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner had not demonstrated that a baccalaureate or higher degree is the normal requirement for the proffered position, or that the performance of its duties were so specialized and complex as to be usually associated with the attainment of such a degree. The director further determined that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary attained the equivalence of a baccalaureate degree through a combination of education, specialized training, and work experience. On appeal, the petitioner argues that the duties of the proffered position are so specialized and complex as to require a

well-educated and experienced individual with a degree. The petitioner asserts that the beneficiary is uniquely qualified to fill the position requirements.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, the alien must meet one of the following criteria:

1. Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
2. Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
3. Hold an unrestricted State license, registration, or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
4. Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

The beneficiary does not hold a baccalaureate degree in any field of study. A credentials evaluation service found the beneficiary's foreign education and diploma from the Leningrad College of Technology in Russia, equivalent to an associate's degree in mechanical engineering technology from a United States college or university. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not shown that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a specialty occupation based upon education alone.

The record indicates that the beneficiary also had approximately eighteen years of employment experience at the time of the filing of the present petition. The evaluator found that the beneficiary's educational background combined with her employment experience equivalent to a bachelor's degree in industrial engineering with a specialization in market research.

This Service uses an independent evaluation of a person's foreign credentials in terms of education in the United States as an advisory opinion only. Where an evaluation is not in accord with previous equivalencies or is in any way questionable, it may be

rejected or given less weight. See Matter of SEA, Inc., 19 I&N Dec. 817 (Comm. 1988).

Here, the evaluation of the beneficiary's foreign credentials is based on education and experience. Although the evaluator found the beneficiary's foreign education and work experience equivalent to a bachelor's degree in industrial engineering with a specialization in market research, the record does not contain any corroborating evidence to support such a claim such as an evaluation from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience. Furthermore, neither the evaluator nor the petitioner have adequately shown that the beneficiary's employment experience was experience in a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the evaluation is accorded little weight.

The beneficiary is not a member of any organizations whose usual prerequisite for entry is a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area. The record contains no evidence that the beneficiary holds a state license, registration, or certification which authorizes her to practice a specialty occupation. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in a specialty occupation.

The term "specialty occupation" is 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:

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.

In a letter which accompanied the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

Does market research in Russia and the former Soviet Republics in ferrous metals, non-ferrous metals, and construction materials. Prepare advertising. Perform sourcing, pricing and procurement for export/import. Negotiates export/import contracts in Russia and composes correspondence.

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

In these proceedings, the duties of the position are dispositive and not the job title. The proffered position appears to combine the duties of a general manager or executive with those of a marketing manager. A review of the Handbook, 2000-2001 edition, at pages 50-51 finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area for employment as a general manager or executive. Degrees in business and in liberal arts fields appear equally welcome. In addition, certain personal qualities and participation in in-house training programs are often considered as important as a specific formal academic background.

A review of the Handbook at pages 25-26 also finds no requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area for employment as a marketing manager. A wide range of educational backgrounds are considered suitable for entry into marketing managerial positions. Some employers prefer degrees in business administration but bachelor's degrees in various liberal arts fields are also acceptable. Here again, certain personal qualities and participation in in-house training programs are often considered as significant as the beneficiary's specific educational background. 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 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.

The petitioner's argument that the duties of the proffered position are so specialized and complex as to require a well-educated and experienced individual with a degree is not persuasive. The petitioner appears to place more value and emphasis on the beneficiary's ability to speak and write fluent Russian in order to conduct business in Russia and surrounding countries, rather than any degree or employment experience she happens to possess. Therefore, the petitioner cannot be considered to have demonstrated 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 in a specialized area.

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

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.