



D2

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Information data generated to
present clearly unwarranted
violation of personal privacy


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



File: EAC-01-001-51734 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: JUL 18 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 is a non-profit church with two employees. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a choral director 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 petitioner had not established that the proffered position requires a baccalaureate degree in music. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the proposed duties require professional training in musical theory, music interpretation, composition, conducting, and instrumental and voice instruction. Counsel submits an expanded description of the duties the petitioner anticipates the beneficiary would perform as a choral director.

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:

Conduct vocal music group, the church choir. Direct the church choir (adult group, youth group, and children group) and the church orchestra at rehearsals and performances to achieve desired effects such as tonal and harmonic balance, dynamics, rhythm, and tempo utilizing knowledge of music.

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 music or a related field. Although the position of choral director may, in some instances, qualify as a specialty occupation, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary's duties as choral director are of such complexity that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, as distinguished from familiarity with music or a less extensive education, is necessary for the successful completion of its duties. It is noted that the beneficiary would be in charge of 34 choral members. It is also noted that although information on the petition indicates that the proffered position is full-time, the record is not clear how such duties are the equivalent of a full-time position. In view of the foregoing, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Second, although counsel states that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specialized area such as music, for the offered position, the record contains no evidence of such. It was held in Matter of Obaiqbena, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988) and Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez, 17 I&N Dec. (BIA 1980) that the assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that businesses similar to the petitioner in their type of operations and number of employees 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 record does not contain an evaluation of the beneficiary's credentials from a service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials as required by 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(3). 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.