




DA

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
inv



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

File: LIN-01-257-53480 Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: NOV - 7 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:



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 construction business with four employees and a gross annual income of \$978,068.60. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an architect for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

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 petitioner had not demonstrated that the beneficiary holds a license to practice as an architect in the State of Michigan, or that it employs a licensed architect who will be supervising the beneficiary's work. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the petitioner has revised the job title of the proffered position from an architect to project engineer.

The issue to be examined in this proceeding is whether the beneficiary is qualified to perform the services of a specialty occupation, which the director concluded was the position of a architect.

On appeal, counsel states that the petitioner has revised the proffered position to that of a project engineer and has revised the duties accordingly.

It is determined that the petitioner has not complied with the terms of the labor condition application because the title of the proffered position is not what is reflected on the application. The record contains no evidence that an amended labor condition application was filed pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(2)(i)(E). It is also noted that the file contains no evidence that an amended petition with fee was filed along with the new labor condition application.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, the alien must meet one of the following criteria:

1. Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
2. Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
3. Hold an unrestricted State license, registration, or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
4. Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

The beneficiary holds a degree in architecture conferred by a Syrian institution. A credentials evaluation service found the beneficiary's foreign education equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree in architecture. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2002-2003 edition, at page 91, finds that all States and the District of Columbia require individuals to be licensed (registered) before they may call themselves architects or contract to provide architectural services. As the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary holds a license to practice as an architect in the State of Michigan, or that it employs a licensed architect who will be supervising the beneficiary's work, it has not demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. For this reason, 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.