



D2

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identification 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: LIN-01-021-53206

Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: 11 MAR 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: 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 and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an information technology solutions business with 30 employees and a gross annual income of \$224,788. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a systems analyst for a period of 26 months. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, the petitioner's administrative manager submits additional information. He had indicated that additional evidence would be submitted in support of the appeal on or before June 1, 2001. To date, no additional evidence has been received by this office. Therefore, the record must be considered complete.

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.

Pursuant to section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

The director denied the petition because the proposed duties appeared to be those of a computer technician, an occupation not requiring a baccalaureate degree. On appeal, the petitioner's administrative manager states, in part, that the nature of the proposed duties are so specialized and complex as to require a baccalaureate degree.

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.

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 the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

Analyzes user requirements, procedures, and problems to automate processing and to improve existing computer systems.

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 the petitioner's argument that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in information and computer science or a related field. Positions in the computer industry are not clearly defined, in part, due to the relative sophistication and fast growth of the industry. Generally, positions in that industry are considered to fall within several groups: engineers (who may design the actual hardware used in computer systems); systems analysts (who may determine the needs of a process, select equipment, plan processing methods, and prepare specifications for programmers); and programmers (who, in turn, write instructions or programs for technicians).

The Service has found that the positions of systems engineer (and related engineering positions including designer), pure systems analyst, and programmer of computers used for scientific or engineering applications are considered to be within the professions, as contemplated by section 101(a)(32) of the Act. The positions of programmer of computers used for business applications and technician, on the other hand, normally require training commonly gained and widely available outside of college or university studies. They are, therefore, usually not considered to be within the professions. (See the sections of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook, (Handbook), 2000-2001 edition, on electrical and electronics engineers, computer systems analysts, computer programmers, and computer service technicians.)

The Handbook at page 115 indicates that while a baccalaureate degree is usually required, a degree in a specialized area does not appear to be a requirement. The Handbook states:

Employers using computers for scientific and engineering applications prefer college graduates who have degrees in computer or information science, mathematics, engineering or the physical sciences. Employers who use computers for business applications prefer to hire people who have had college courses in information systems...and business and who possess strong programming skills.

The petitioner has not shown why a position not considered a profession should be considered a specialty occupation. Additionally, the petitioner has not established that the proffered position is of such complexity that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, as distinguished from familiarity with computers 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 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 information and computer science, 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 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.