



Handwritten mark resembling a stylized 'M' or 'W'.

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



Public Copy

File: EAC-00-009-54394 Office: Vermont Service Center Date: JUL 16 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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:
[Redacted]

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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
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 software development and consulting company with more than 2000 employees and an undisclosed gross annual income. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a systems analyst for a period of three years. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

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 beneficiary's educational background (B.S. degree in mechanical engineering) and work experience do not qualify him for the position of programmer/analyst. On appeal, counsel states in part that the petitioner has approximately 500 employees in the U.S. in H-1B status, of whom an approximate 16% hold degrees in mechanical engineering.

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 holds a bachelor of technology degree in mechanical engineering conferred by an Indian institution. A credentials evaluation service found the beneficiary's foreign education equivalent to bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering conferred by a U.S. institution.

The proffered position appears to be that of a computer systems analyst. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2000-2001 edition, at pages 111-112 finds that the usual requirement for employment as a computer scientist, systems analyst, or engineer is a baccalaureate degree in computer science, information science, or management information systems.

The record contains no evidence that the beneficiary's baccalaureate degree in mechanical engineering is equivalent to a baccalaureate degree in computer science, information science, or management information systems. In addition, although the record indicates that the beneficiary had over four years of relevant employment experience at the time of the filing of the petition, the record contains no evidence that the experience was experience in a specialty occupation or that it is sufficient to overcome the beneficiary's lack of a degree in a specialized and related field of study. It is further noted that the record does not contain 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.

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 him

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.

With respect to counsel'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.

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. Accordingly, the decision of the director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.