

D2

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

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

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



File: LIN-00-058-52259 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 13 2003

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, Nebraska Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and reconsider. The motion will be granted. The previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed.

The petitioner, a service provider for visiting Japanese business professionals, provides support services for transportation, entertainment venues, and tours. It has three employees and a projected gross annual income of \$60,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a services manager 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 had provided additional information in support of the appeal.

The AAO dismissed the appeal reasoning that the petitioner had not provided evidence to establish that the beneficiary holds the equivalent of a baccalaureate degree. The AAO also found, beyond the decision of the director, that the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On motion, counsel states, in part, that because of the cultural complexities of the proposed duties, the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. Counsel also states that the beneficiary's law degree and employment background qualify her for the proffered position.

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.

Counsel's statement on motion 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:

Services Manager will make client contacts, targeting large Japanese corporations with executives traveling to the U.S. Build relationship for sales department to take over and make service sales. Will oversee staff, establish hours and activities. Will review service packages to insure appropriate staff availability; make policies; oversee all corporate communications. Work to insure quality of services, as well as consistency. Make agreements with local vendors for service deals. Will utilize knowledge of contract law for Japan and will use the Japanese language. Will supervise two to ten employees.

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 law or a related field. The proffered position appears to combine the duties of a marketing manager with those of a travel agent. In its *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, 2002-2003 edition, at page 28, the Department of Labor (DOL) finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty for employment as a marketing manager. A wide range of educational backgrounds is considered suitable for entry into marketing managerial positions. Some employers prefer a bachelor's or master's degree in business administration with an emphasis on marketing, but many employers prefer those with experience in related occupations plus a broad liberal arts background. In addition, most marketing management positions are filled by promoting experienced staff or related professional or technical personnel.

The *Handbook* at page 377 also finds no requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty for employment as a travel agent. The minimum requirement is a high school diploma or its equivalent for entry into travel agent positions. As technology and computerization are having a profound effect on the work of travel agents, some form of specialized training, such as that offered in many vocational schools, adult public education programs, and in community and 4-year colleges, is becoming increasingly important. In addition, certain personal qualities and participation in in-house training programs are often considered as significant as the beneficiary's specific educational background. 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 established that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specific specialty such as Japanese law, for the offered position. Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is common to the industry in parallel positions among organizations similar to the petitioner. The pages from the websites of the U.S. Departments of State and Commerce are noted. It is not entirely clear, however, how such information applies to the instant petition. 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.

As the petitioner has not sufficiently established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation, the beneficiary's qualifications need not be examined further in this proceeding.

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 decision of the AAO dated February 15, 2002, is affirmed.