




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



File: EAC-99-050-50933 Office: Vermont Service Center


Date: NOV 20 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, Acting Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was approved by the Director, Vermont Service Center. Based upon information obtained from the American Embassy in Moscow, the director determined that the beneficiary was not clearly eligible for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director properly served the petitioner with notice of his intent to revoke approval of the visa petition and his reasons therefore, and ultimately revoked the approval of the petition. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a dental clinic with three employees and a gross annual income of \$250,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a general manager for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a letter from the petitioner.

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 record contains a report from an Embassy official in Moscow, dated September 13, 1999, stating in part that the beneficiary's annual salary paid by the petitioner is \$18,720 which is far below the prevailing wage reflected on its labor condition application. The report also indicates that the beneficiary's proposed duties are vague, and her previous job positions in the several years prior to her departure from Russia were those of a travel agent and a video rental clerk.

The director revoked the petition because the petitioner had not demonstrated that the beneficiary's duties are so complex as to require a baccalaureate degree. On appeal, the petitioner states in part that during the first six months of her employment, the beneficiary was in training and therefore she received a lesser salary. The petitioner also states that evidence of the alien's professional qualifications have already been submitted.

The petitioner'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:

- a) Manage and run operations of the dental clinic.
- b) Establish operational procedures and standards for activities such as verification of utility services, maintenance, handling customer service and complaints, bills, etc.
- c) Discretionary day to day decision making regarding purchasing of products & supplies in coordination with dental equipment.
- d) Audits vouchers, contracts, orders and prepares reports to substantiate individual transactions prior to settlement.
- e) Hire, train and discharge employees.
- f) Coordinates technical liaison services between dental technicians, staff and customers.

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 the petitioner's argument that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in economics or a related field. The proffered position appears to combine the duties of an office and administrative support manager with those of a bookkeeper. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook), 2000-2001 edition, at pages 311-312 finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area for employment as an office and administrative support manager. Most businesses fill administrative and office support supervisory and managerial positions by promoting clerical or administrative support workers within their organizations. In addition, certain personal qualities such as strong teamwork and problem solving skills and a good working knowledge of the organization's computer system are often considered as important as a specific formal academic background.

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. 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 economics, 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. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

Beyond the decision of the director, the labor condition application was certified on December 8, 1998, a date subsequent to November 27, 1998, the filing date of the visa petition. Regulations at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B)(1) provide that before filing a petition for H-1B classification in a specialty occupation, the petitioner shall obtain a certification from the Department of Labor that it has filed a labor condition

application. 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.