



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

DR

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



File: EAC-99-217-53135 Office: Vermont Service Center


Date: **NOV 27 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 fabric and garment importer with four employees and a gross annual income of \$350,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an assistant textile import 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 brief.

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 did not appear to be so complex as to require a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area. On appeal, counsel provides an expanded description of the proposed duties and evidence that the beneficiary was granted H-1B status for the same position in another company. Counsel states that the nature of the proffered position is so complex as to require a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area.

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:

- 1) assisting import manager who imports textiles mainly from Korea;
- 2) assist the manager with merchandising various textiles;

- 3) receiving orders with specific design and fabric requirements from the U.S. wholesalers and textile converters;
- 4) ordering and communicating with the Korean manufacturer to assure that they comply with the client's specific requirements;
- 5) must have professional knowledge in textile design and merchandising.

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 proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in a textile-related field. Counsel asserts that the Department of Labor has determined that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. However, a reference in the Department of Labor's (DOL) Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT), Fourth Edition, 1977, standing alone, is not enough to establish an occupation is a specialty occupation. The DOT classification system and its categorization of an occupation as "professional and kindred" are not directly related to membership in a profession or specialty occupation as defined in immigration law. In the DOT listing of occupations, any given subject area within the professions contains nonprofessional work, as well as work within the professions.

The latest edition of the DOT does not give information about the educational and other requirements for the different occupations.

This type of information is currently furnished by the DOL in the various editions of the Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook). The latter publication is given considerable weight (certainly much more than the DOT) in determining whether an occupation is within the professions. This is because it provides specific and detailed information regarding the educational and other requirements for occupations.

The proffered position appears to be similar to that of a general manager. A review of the DOL's 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. 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 textiles, 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. It is noted that of the four companies listed by counsel which require baccalaureate degrees for "similar positions," the gross annual income is listed for only two (both of which have a total of ten employees). One of the companies is listed as having a \$4.6 million gross annual income and the another is listed as having a \$10 million gross annual income. According to the record at filing, the petitioner in the instant case was established in 1995, currently employs four positions, and has a gross annual income of \$350,000. This does not compare to the level of business activities of the businesses listed by counsel above. 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.

With respect to counsel's objection to denial of this petition in view of the approval of a similar petition in the past, this Service is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated. The record indicates that

the beneficiary is currently an assistant import manager for a textile manufacturer and import business having six employees and a gross annual income of \$270 million. As the size and gross annual income of the petitioner in the instant petition are considerably smaller and its business activities do not involve manufacturing, it has not been persuasively established that the two petitions are similar.

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.