



D2

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identification data destroyed -
prevent disclosure of
invasion of personal privacy

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



File: LIN-99-249-51424 Office: Nebraska Service Center Date: 20 FEB 2002

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

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

The petitioner is a law firm with four employees and a gross annual income of \$90,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an assistant translator for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation or that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a statement. Counsel had indicated that additional evidence would be submitted in support of the appeal on or before June 3, 2001. To date, no additional evidence has been received by this office. Therefore, the record must be considered complete.

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 or higher degree. The director also found that the beneficiary's educational background in business administration did not appear to be related to the proposed duties. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the proffered position, which involves the translation of business and legal documents, requires a business background or at least a bachelor's degree.

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. The petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

Interview clients with Senior Translator and/or attorney and translate communications between client and attorney, providing back and forth translations from Korean to English and English to Korean on various legal matters.
[35% of time]

Translate various legal documents from Korean into English and from English into Korean, using Microsoft Word and Korean word processing program.
[55% of time]

Confer with Senior Translator about work to be performed and go over work already performed.
[5% of time]

Discussions with Senior Translator in re the importance of various legal documents (and the legal system) that beneficiary must know.
[5% of time]

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 business administration or a related field. The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary's duties as a translator are of such complexity that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, as distinguished from familiarity with the Korean and English languages or a less extensive education, is necessary for

the successful completion of its duties. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree in a specialized area 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. Third, although the petitioner has submitted various internet job listings, 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.

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 appeal is dismissed.