



*Handwritten mark resembling a stylized 'M' or 'W'.*

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-00-060-51717 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: 07 SEP 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:



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 and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an international air and sea shipping business with 200 employees and a gross annual income of \$15,300,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an import customer service 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 record contained insufficient evidence that the proffered position qualified as a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel states in part that the beneficiary supervises two employees. The petitioner's president also submits an excerpt from the Department of Labor's (DOL) Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook) indicating that the positions similar to the proffered one normally require a baccalaureate degree. The petitioner's president further states that all of the petitioner's previous holders of the proffered position or similar positions have had the same or similar educational backgrounds as the beneficiary.

Counsel's and the petitioner's statements on appeal are 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:

...he will be overseeing all customer service matters regarding imports. He will be responsible for developing

overall plans, setting goals and developing customer service procedures involving our international transportation services, in accordance with company procedures, for all import sales and service. [The beneficiary] will visit existing clients on a regular basis to insure their satisfaction with our company's services. He will be in charge of all shipment tracing on behalf of our clients and the network, as well as ensuring that all procedures are followed with regard to shipping freight and execution of documentation. In addition to this, he will be responsible for providing customers and the network with reliable quotes as to shipping charges and times, and have daily contact with airline representatives as well as handling e-mail correspondence within the SDV network. He will report to ...our Operations Manager.

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 import customer service manager would normally require a bachelor's degree in business administration or a related field. In its Handbook, 2000-2001 edition, at page 521, the DOL indicates that under the category of "communications, transportation, and utilities operations managers" general managers of large operations or establishments should be reported as general managers or top executives. 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 business administration, for the offered position. The copy of a diploma for Laura DiBrita demonstrates that she has a bachelor of arts degree. Her area of studies, however, is not indicated. Further, as the petitioner has been in operation since 1969, demonstrating that only one other employee holds a baccalaureate degree does not sufficiently establish that a degree in a specialized area is a normal requirement. 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.

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.