



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 99 034 54341 Office: Vermont Service Center Date: 28 NOV 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: Self-represented



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, 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 computer consulting firm with four employees and an unspecified gross annual income. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a systems analyst for a period of three years. The director found that the petitioner had not demonstrated that the proffered position is a specialty occupation or that the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel argues 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 proffered position appears to be a systems analyst position and is, as such, a specialty occupation. The beneficiary does not hold a United States baccalaureate degree. The beneficiary does hold a baccalaureate degree in education and a master's degree in education conferred by Indian institutions. The record contains no evidence that the beneficiary took any academic computer courses while an undergraduate or graduate student. The beneficiary also holds a certificate in Visual Basic 4.0, a certificate in software quality assurance testing, and a diploma in office automation. Finally, the beneficiary had over three years of relevant employment experience.

A credentials evaluation service has determined that the beneficiary's education and experience are equivalent to bachelor's degree in computer science conferred by a United States college or university. 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. The evaluator has not demonstrated specifically how the evaluation was made nor the basis for making it (including copies of the relevant portions of any research materials used). The petitioner has not shown how various aspects of the beneficiary's background might be considered equivalent to courses required to complete a degree in computer science. In addition, there is no evidence of the evaluator's background and experience in performing evaluations of this type. Accordingly, the evaluation is accorded little weight.

The petitioner has cited a published decision of the Service, an unpublished decision of the Service, and a decision of a federal court in support of his assertion that the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation. Service employees are not bound by unpublished decisions. The Service does not consider itself bound by the court decision outside the Central District of California. In addition, the petitioner has not established the relevance of any of these decisions to the facts and issues of this proceeding.

The beneficiary is not a member of any organizations whose usual prerequisite for entry is a baccalaureate degree in a specialized field of study. 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 qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation.

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.