



**DA**

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

to trying data access to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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



File: EAC-01-066-51199 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: **AUG 05 2002**

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 that 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 that 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 that 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 direct lender mortgage banker specializing in home mortgages with forty employees and a gross annual income of \$3 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a post closing officer for a period of two years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. The director further determined that the petitioner had not submitted a certified labor condition application.

On appeal, counsel submits a statement and documentation.

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.

The term "specialty occupation" is defined at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(ii) 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 determined that the proffered position of post closing officer was not a specialty occupation because the performance of its duties does not require a baccalaureate or higher degree. On appeal, counsel argues that the Service has previously approved petitions for similar positions, including one that the petitioner had submitted in prior years.

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.

In a separate letter that accompanied the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the beneficiary in the offered position as follows:

1. Audits and verifies completeness of processed loan documents to maintain quality of service to borrowers and to comply with the agency and investor guidelines;
2. Verifies accuracy and consistency of loan documents prior to warehousing;
3. Key in data in the computer accurately for the purchase of loans;
4. Send out the Assignment of Mortgage for recording and send a copy of the recorded Assignment of Mortgage to the investors.

The duties of proffered position parallel those of a loan counselor or loan officer. In the Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook), 2002-2003 edition, at pages 68-70, the Department of Labor lists the minimum requirement for employment as a loan counselor or loan officer as a bachelor's degree in finance, economics, or a related field. In view of the foregoing, it is determined that the petitioner has demonstrated that the proffered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of regulations. Therefore, it is concluded that the petitioner has overcome this particular basis of denial put forth by the director.

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.

While the director determined that the record did not contain a properly filed Form ETA 9035, labor condition application, the petitioner provided a properly endorsed and certified labor condition application prior to the denial of the petition. Counsel's statements regarding delays experienced in obtaining the certified labor condition from the Department of Labor are acknowledged. Nevertheless, that application was certified on July 18, 2001, a date subsequent to December 26, 2000, 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. Since this has not occurred, it is concluded that the petition may not be approved.

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.