



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: EAC 97 150 52008 Office: Vermont Service Center Date:

MAY 2 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)

Public Copy

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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, Acting Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director. A subsequent appeal and motion to reopen were dismissed by the Associate Commissioner for Examinations. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner on a second motion to reopen. The motion will be granted and the previous decisions of the director and the Associate Commissioner will be affirmed.

The petitioner is a hotel chain with 110 employees which seeks to employ the beneficiary as a computer programmer for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation. The Associate Commissioner also found that the petitioner had not shown that the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation.

On motion, counsel reiterates his argument that the proffered position is a specialty occupation and the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

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.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(B), the petitioner shall submit the following with an H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation:

1. A certification from the Secretary of Labor that the petitioner has filed a labor condition application with the Secretary,

2. A statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application for the duration of the alien's authorized period of stay, and

3. Evidence that the alien qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation.

The petitioner has provided a certified labor condition application and a statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application.

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's foreign education has been found by a credentials evaluation service to be equivalent to high school graduation and three years of undergraduate study in liberal arts at a United States institution. 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.

Counsel has provided evaluations by three individuals who assert that the beneficiary's education plus his experience are equivalent to a baccalaureate degree in computer science. On motion, these evaluations are supported by an additional evaluation from a credentials evaluation service which supports their conclusion. 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 evaluations of the beneficiary's foreign credentials are based on education and experience. The evaluators have not demonstrated specifically how the evaluations were made or the basis for making them (including copies of the relevant portions of any research materials used). In addition, there is insufficient evidence of the evaluators' background and experience in performing evaluations of this type. Finally, neither the evaluators nor the petitioner have adequately supported their assertion that the beneficiary's 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 him to practice a specialty occupation. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the proffered position is 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.

The duties of the proffered position are described in pertinent part as follows:

We would like to employ [the beneficiary] as a computer programmer to analyze and organize our data management system and financial management system and to advise us and assist us in installing, organizing and maintaining this management information system.

The foregoing description is insufficient to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. The duties are described in an abstract form with no indication as to their actual level of complexity. This description provides no impression of the beneficiary's actual day-to-day activities. There is sufficient information to characterize the proffered position as essentially computer programming for business purposes with some entry-level analysis functions.

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. 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 proffered position. In addition, the petitioner has not shown that similar firms require the services of such individuals in parallel positions.

Counsel has provided a letter from a similar firm which states that it requires a baccalaureate degree in computer science for a position similar to the proffered position. The firm has not shown that all individuals employed in that position since it was created held bachelor's degrees in computer science.

Positions in the computer industry are not clearly defined, in part, due to the relative sophistication and fast growth of the industry. Generally, positions in that industry are considered to fall within several groups: engineers (who may design the actual hardware used in computer systems); systems analysts (who may determine the needs of a process, select equipment, plan processing methods, and prepare specifications for programmers); and programmers (who, in turn, write instructions or programs for technicians).

The Service has found that the positions of systems engineer (and related engineering positions including designer), pure systems analyst, and programmer of computers used for scientific or engineering applications are considered to be specialty occupations and within the professions, as contemplated by section 101(a) (32) of the Act. The positions of programmer of computers used for business applications and technician, on the other hand, normally require training commonly gained and widely available outside of college or university studies. They are, therefore, usually not considered to be specialty occupations or within the professions. (See the sections of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook), 2000-2001 Edition on electrical and electronics engineers, computer systems analysts, computer programmers, and computer service technicians).

The Handbook at page 115 indicates that while a baccalaureate degree is usually required, a degree in a specialized area does not appear to be a requirement. The Handbook states:

Employers using computers for scientific and engineering applications usually prefer college graduates who have degrees in computer or information science, mathematics, engineering or the physical sciences. Graduate degrees are required for some jobs. Employers who use computers for business applications prefer to hire people who have had college courses in information systems ... and business, and who possess strong programming skills.

The petitioner has not shown why a position not considered a profession should be considered a specialty occupation. Additionally, the petitioner has not established that the proffered position is of such complexity that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, as distinguished from familiarity or a less extensive education, is necessary for the successful completion of its duties. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the proffered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of regulations.

With respect to counsel's objection to denial of this petition in view of the previous approval of a similar petition in the beneficiary's behalf, this Service is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated. The previous petition and its supporting documents have been reviewed. The petition appears to have been approved in error. The Court of Appeals held in Sussex Engineering, Ltd. v. Montgomery, 825 F. 2d 1084 (6th Cir. 1987), held that it is absurd to suggest that the Service or any agency must treat acknowledged error as binding precedent.

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 decisions of the director and the Associate Commissioner will not be disturbed.

**ORDER:** The order of September 9, 1998 dismissing this appeal is affirmed.