



DA

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data deleted 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: WAC-01-137-57315 Office: California Service Center

Date: JUL 08 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 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 and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner exports plastic recycling materials. It has three employees and a gross annual income of \$8,751,814. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a translator 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 duties described by the petitioner did not appear to be so complex as to require a baccalaureate degree. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the proffered duties which include translation tasks relating to Sino-American trade, legal, technical, and safety documents or materials, are so complex that a baccalaureate degree in English and international marketing is required. Counsel cites unpublished decisions as well as Matter of Desai, 17 I&N Dec. 569 (BIA 1980), in support of his claim.

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:

"Translates documents and other material from Chinese to English and vice versa. Reads material and rewrites material, following established rules pertaining to factors, such as word meanings, sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and mechanics. Express either approximate or exact translation, depending on

differences between the English and Chinese culture and customs."

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 English and international marketing or an equivalent thereof. 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 Chinese and English or a less extensive education, is necessary for the successful completion of its duties. Counsel cites unpublished AAU decisions, which have no precedential effect in this proceeding. See 8 C.F.R. 103.3(c). Counsel also cites Matter of Desai, 17 I&N Dec. 569 (BIA 1980). The beneficiary in the cited decision was a technical writer who possessed the equivalent of a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering in addition to a degree in journalism. It has not been shown that the complexity of the proposed duties in the instant petition warrants comparison with the duties performed by the beneficiary in the decision cited by counsel. Even if the Service were to agree with counsel's argument that the petitioner's duties are the essence of technical writing that would generally require a college degree as a technical writer, it cannot be concluded that the proffered position is a specialty occupation as the petitioner does not require a bachelor's degree with an emphasis on both writing and science. Furthermore, although counsel argues that the beneficiary holds the equivalent of an international marketing degree, marketing

positions are not generally considered to be specialty occupations. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2002-2003 edition, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher 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 a bachelor's or master's degree in business administration with an emphasis on marketing, but many employers prefer those with experience in related occupations plus a broad liberal arts background. In addition, 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 such as English and international marketing, 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. 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.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner's labor condition application was certified on June 5, 2001, a date subsequent to March 19, 2001, 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. As this matter will be dismissed on the grounds discussed, this issue need not be examined further.

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.