



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



Public Copy

File: EAC-99-057-50391 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: OCT 11 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:



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, Vermont Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Associate Commissioner for Examinations. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on motion to reopen and reconsider. The motion will be granted. The previous decision of the Associate Commissioner will be affirmed.

The petitioner is a flower import business with three employees and a gross annual income of \$1.7 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a flower importer/agent 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 had provided additional information in support of the appeal.

The Associate Commissioner dismissed the appeal reasoning that the proffered position combined the duties of general manager or executive with those of a marketing manager, occupations that do not require a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area. The Associate Commissioner also found, beyond the director's decision, that the beneficiary did not qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation.

On motion, counsel states in part that the beneficiary's employment background should be considered as well as his ability to speak Spanish. Counsel also cites a court decision in support of her argument that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

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:

[The beneficiary's] job will be to coordinate international import business with Latin America, and negotiate with wholesalers and shippers. He has a business background to deal with international rates, foreign contracts, shipping invoices, customs regulations, and to bill shippers and foreign carriers. He will plan, direct and support all traffic from overseas destinations. [The beneficiary's] best and most necessary asset to us is his ability to speak Spanish, as all of our overseas suppliers are Spanish speaking...

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 of flower importer/agent would normally require a bachelor's degree in a specialized area. The proffered position appears to combine the duties of a general manager or executive with those of a marketing manager. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook (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.

A review of the Handbook at pages 25-26 also finds no requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area for employment as a marketing manager. A wide range of educational backgrounds are considered suitable for entry into marketing managerial positions. Some employers prefer degrees in business administration but bachelor's degrees in various liberal arts fields are also acceptable. Here again, certain personal qualities and participation in in-house training programs are often considered as significant as the beneficiary's specific educational 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 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. The court decision cited by counsel is noted. The business of the petitioner in the cited case was catering to the living needs of workers at geophysical drilling and mining camps in remote regions of the world. The duties of the beneficiary in the cited decision included bidding and negotiating contracts with large corporate clients, corporate financial planning, technical design, and purchasing sophisticated equipment. It has not been shown that the level of the petitioner's business activities or the complexity of the beneficiary's proposed duties warrant comparison with the business and duties in the decision cited by counsel. Further, regarding the beneficiary's Spanish-speaking duties, the petitioner has not established that such duties are of such complexity that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, as distinguished from familiarity with the Spanish language or a less extensive education, is necessary for the successful completion of its duties.

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.

As the petitioner has not sufficiently established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation, the beneficiary's qualifications need not be examined further in this proceeding.

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 decision of the Associate Commissioner dated August 24, 1999, is affirmed.