

D2

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F  
Washington, D.C. 20536



AUG 21 2007

File: EAC-02-027-53322 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date:

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)

ON 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 Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a garment retailer with three employees and an approximate gross annual income of \$25 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a merchandising manager 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.

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 a baccalaureate degree is required for the proffered position. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the Department of Labor (DOL) in its *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)* and in its *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* has found that a merchandising manager position requires a baccalaureate degree. Counsel further states that the petitioner has submitted numerous advertisements to demonstrate that similar businesses require such a degree. Counsel additionally states that the petitioner's president, who is currently performing the duties of a merchandising manager, holds a Bachelor of Science degree in economics and finance.

Counsel's statement on appeal is not persuasive. The Bureau 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 Bureau considers. In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

- Set and monitor goals for each product line to grow sales and margin;
- Supervise product sourcing and act as a liaison between Plus Impact Ltd. and overseas vendors and contractors;
- Oversee sales research; Select products from overseas according to industry trends and case studies;
- Design and develop merchandising samples for showrooms; Oversee production coordination;
- Assist in hiring Merchandisers; Train and coordinate activities of Merchandisers to ensure time- and cost-effective completion of product-development projects;
- Coordinate inventory; [and]
- Prepare Merchandising Department's annual budget; As part of the Management team, assist in preparing Plus Impact's annual budget.

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 Bureau does not agree with counsel's assertion that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in merchandising management, or an equivalent thereof, or that the proffered position "clearly qualifies as a transition occupation." The proffered position is similar to that of a purchasing manager, buyer, and purchasing agent. Counsel asserts that the proffered position is a specialty occupation because it has been assigned a specific SVP rating in the DOL's *DOT* (4th Ed., Rev. 1991). However, the AAO does not consider the *DOT* a persuasive source of information regarding whether a particular job 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.

The DOL has replaced the *DOT* with the *Occupational Information Network (O\*Net)*. Both the *DOT* and *O\*Net* provide only general information regarding the tasks and work activities associated with a particular occupation, as well as the education, training and experience required to perform the duties of that occupation. The DOL's *Handbook* provides a more comprehensive description of the nature of a particular occupation and the education, training and experience normally required to enter into an occupation and advance within that occupation. For this reason, the Bureau is not persuaded by a claim that the proffered position is a specialty occupation simply because the DOL has assigned it a specific SVP rating in the *DOT*.

A review of the DOL's *Handbook*, 2002-2003 edition, at page 82, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty for employment as a purchasing manager, buyer, and purchasing agent. Educational requirements tend to vary according to the size of the organization. Large distributors and stores, especially those in wholesale and retail trade, prefer applicants who have completed a bachelor's degree program with a business emphasis. (Emphasis added.) (It is noted that a baccalaureate degree appears to be a preference by large distributors and stores rather than a requirement. It is also noted that the petitioner has only three employees.) Regardless of their academic preparation, new employees must learn the specifics of their employers' business. Training periods vary in length, with most lasting 1 to 5 years. 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 demonstrated that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specific specialty such as merchandising management for the offered position. Counsel's assertion that the petitioner has demonstrated that it normally requires such a degree because its president, who holds a baccalaureate degree in economics and finance, has been performing the duties of a merchandising manager is noted. Even if the Bureau were to conclude that the petitioner has demonstrated that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specific specialty such as merchandising management for the offered position, the petitioner's reasoning would be problematic when viewed in light of the statutory definition of specialty occupation. The petitioner's creation of a position with a perfunctory bachelor's degree requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. As with employment agencies as petitioners, the Bureau must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). The critical element is not the title of the position or an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a bachelor's degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.<sup>1</sup> To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if the Bureau was limited to reviewing a petitioner's self-imposed employment requirements, then any alien with a bachelor's degree could be brought into the United States to perform a menial, non-professional, or an otherwise non-specialty occupation, so long as the employer required all such employees to have bachelor's degrees. See *id.* at 388.

In this case, although counsel asserts that the petitioner normally hires only individuals with a bachelor's degree in merchandising management or an equivalent thereof, for its merchandising manager position, the position, nevertheless, does not meet the statutory definition of specialty occupation. The position, itself, does not require the theoretical and practical

---

<sup>1</sup> The court in *Defensor v. Meissner* observed that the four criteria at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) present certain ambiguities when compared to the statutory definition, and "might also be read as merely an additional requirement that a position must meet, in addition to the statutory and regulatory definition." *Supra* at 387.

application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Therefore, even though the petitioner has required a bachelor's degree in the past, the position still does not require a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty.

Third, the two approval notices for merchandising manager positions are noted. For the reasons discussed herein, however, this office is not convinced that the petitioner has persuasively demonstrated that a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary. The AAO is never bound by a decision of a service center or district director. *Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS*, 44 F.Supp. 2d 800, 803 (E.D. La. 2000), *aff'd*, 248 F. 3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S.Ct. 51 (2001).

Also noted are the various job advertisements that have been submitted. None of the advertisements, however, is persuasive evidence of a degree requirement being common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. The petitioner has not demonstrated that the proposed duties of the proffered position are as complex as the duties described in the advertised positions. For example, one of the advertisements reflects duties such as "[hiring] designers, copywriters, demo vendors, technical support, and point-of-purchase production vendors." Another advertisement reflects duties such as "[m]anage an organization of Product managers, Product Coordinators, technical service people, Advertising Manager and creative design production."

Additionally noted are the four letters from businesses that employ merchandising managers. All of the writers state that positions such as the proffered position require a bachelor's degree in business administration, merchandising, or an equivalent. The writers, however, have not provided evidence in support of their assertions. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

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.

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.