



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: EAC-02-041-54635 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: OCT 18 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
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 general dentistry practice with nine employees and an approximate gross annual income of \$350,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a dental assistant 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 demonstrated that the proffered position requires a baccalaureate degree. The director further found that although the petitioner's representative revised the job position title, the petitioner's labor condition application lists the job title as "dental assistant." On appeal, counsel states, in part, that he is submitting a new certified labor condition application with the more appropriate title of "oral and dental disease researcher." Counsel further states that "it is now conceded that a dental assistant does not qualify as a specialty occupation." Counsel submits an expanded description of the duties the petitioner anticipates the beneficiary would perform as an oral and dental disease researcher.

As counsel has conceded that a dental assistant position is not a specialty occupation, that issue need not be discussed further.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(B), the petitioner shall submit the following with an H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation:

1. A certification from the Secretary of Labor that the petitioner has filed a labor condition application with the Secretary,

2. A statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application for the duration of the alien's authorized period of stay,

3. Evidence that the alien qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation . . .

Despite counsel's claim that a new labor condition application with a revised job title has been submitted, the record as it is presently constituted does not contain an amended labor condition application. Rather, the record contains a labor condition application for a dental assistant position that was certified by the Department of Labor on July 27, 2001. Even if the revised labor condition application had been submitted, however, counsel indicates that it was certified on January 23, 2002, a date subsequent to November 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.

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. In view of the foregoing, 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.