



PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

DA

**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-02-053-55063 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: JAN 16 2003

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

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 software developer with 110 employees and a gross annual income of \$11 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer/analyst 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, the petitioner 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 has not demonstrated that the beneficiary holds a college degree, or that his employment experience qualifies him for the proffered position. On appeal, the petitioner's human resources manager states that the beneficiary's work experience is the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in computer science. She submits an evaluation from an academic expert in support of her claim. She further states that the beneficiary previously was granted H-1B status by the Service.

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.

In a letter dated November 27, 2001, the petitioner's human resources manager states, in part, that the beneficiary "holds the equivalent of a Masters Degree in Management with an underlying Bachelor of Science." The beneficiary's resume indicates that he holds a master's degree in business management and a bachelor's degree in science. A credentials evaluator found the beneficiary's foreign education in combination with his employment experience equivalent to a bachelor's degree with a major in computer information systems conferred by an accredited American college or university.

This Service uses an independent evaluation of a person's foreign credentials in terms of education in the United States as an advisory opinion only. Where an evaluation is not in accord with previous equivalencies or is in any way questionable, it may be rejected or given less weight. See Matter of Sea, Inc., 19 I&N Dec. 817 (Comm. 1988).

Here, the evaluation of the beneficiary's foreign credentials is based on education and experience. The record, however, does not contain any evidence of the beneficiary's foreign education, such as copies of his degrees and transcripts. Accordingly, the evaluation is accorded little weight.

The proffered position appears to be that of a programmer/analyst. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2002-2003 edition, at page 182, finds that for employment as a systems analyst, programmer-analyst, as well as database administrator positions, many employers seek applicants who have a bachelor's degree in computer science, information science, or management information systems (MIS). As the record does not contain evidence of the beneficiary's foreign education, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary holds a

bachelor's degree in computer science, information science, or management information systems (MIS), or an equivalent thereof.

The petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary's computer training is equivalent to an academic major field of study at a United States institution. Nor has the petitioner shown that the beneficiary's employment experience is sufficient to overcome his lack of a degree in a specialized and computer-related field of study.

The beneficiary is not a member of any organizations whose usual prerequisite for entry is a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty. The record contains no evidence that the beneficiary holds a state license, registration, or certification which authorizes him to practice a specialty occupation. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in a specialty occupation.

With respect to counsel's objection to denial of this petition in view of the approval of similar petitions in the past, the Associate Commissioner, through the Administrative Appeals Office, is not bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D.La. 2000), aff'd, 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), cert. denied, 122 S. Ct.51 (U.S. 2001).

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.