


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



FILE: WAC 01 246 57649 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 09 2004

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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Handwritten signature of Robert P. Wiemann in black ink.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is an import/export company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a financial analyst. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to 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).

The director denied the petition because the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184 (i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) 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 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.

Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) interprets the term "degree" in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a financial analyst. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's June 26, 2001 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner's

response to the director's request for evidence. According to the letter of support, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail: preparing management operation reports, budgets and cash flow projections; preparing reports outlining the financial position in areas of income, expenses and earnings based on past, present and future operations; performing internal audits; preparing reports for management; providing tax planning advice; and assisting in the preparation of quarterly and annual tax forms. In the response to the director's request for evidence, counsel stated that the beneficiary's duties would include: monitoring the financial plan of the company by reviewing reports and accounting records to determine if allocated funds have been spent as specified; extracting and analyzing data relating to the foreign merchandising industry; analyzing market developments; writing reports explaining causes of variations and making recommendations for new or revised financial plans and budgets; and planning future business expansion.

There is a significant change in duties between the initial petition and the response to the director's request for evidence. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12). Any evidence that adds duties not described at the time of filing the petition will not be considered. Eligibility must be established at the time of filing; a visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978).

A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to CIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm. 1998). Therefore, the duties listed in the initial petition will be those on which this matter will be adjudicated.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the job is not a financial analyst position, but a bookkeeper or accounting clerk position. Citing to the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, the director noted that the minimum requirement for entry into the position was not a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. The director found further that the petitioner failed to establish any of the criteria found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). The director also raised concerns about whether a bona fide position existed.

While it is not for CIS to make a determination as to the business necessity of a given position in adjudicating this classification of visa petition, the petitioner does, of course, need to establish that the position actually exists. The change of duties between the initial petition and the response to the director's request for evidence makes it difficult to determine if a bona fide position exists.

On appeal, counsel states that the petitioner established its business need for a financial analyst, and that the duties described in the proffered position are equivalent to those of both a financial analyst and a budget analyst, as described in the *Handbook*, and that the position is a specialty occupation.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has established none of the four criteria outlined in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Therefore, the proffered position is not a specialty occupation.

The AAO turns first to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2 (h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2): a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position; a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations; or a particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree.

Factors often considered by CIS when determining these criteria include: whether the *Handbook* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." See *Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1165 (D.Min. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Slattery*, 764 F. Supp. 872, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The AAO does not concur with counsel that the proffered position is that of a financial analyst, as described in the *Handbook*. Financial analysts study companies to determine the investment decisions that should be made by their employers. The proffered position does not encompass any of the duties of a financial analyst as described in the *Handbook*. A review of the budget analyst job description does include some elements of the revised duties as listed in the response to the director's request for evidence. As mentioned above, however, those new duties will not be considered for the purposes of this adjudication. The bookkeeper or accounting clerk job description in the *Handbook* confirms the accuracy of the director's assessment to the effect that, the job duties cited in the initial petition parallel those responsibilities of a bookkeeper or accounting clerk. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for these positions.

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for financial analysts. There is no evidence, however, to show that the employers issuing those postings are similar to the petitioner, or that the advertised positions are parallel to the instant position. Many of the listings are for much larger organizations, and/or include duties not a part of the proffered position. On appeal, counsel states, "[I]t does not, however, relate to showing that a particular size of business, or a particular industry requires such degree." The regulations state, "The degree requirement [must be] common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations." A similar organization would be a company of similar size within the petitioner's same industry. There is no other way to define "similar organization," despite counsel's assertions otherwise. Because the majority of the advertisements are for positions that are in vastly different industries for organizations much larger than the petitioner's, and the job duties are frequently not similar, the advertisements have little relevance.

The record also does not include any evidence from professional associations regarding an industry standard, or documentation to support the complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position. The petitioner has, thus, not established the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) or (2).

The AAO now turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) – the employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position. This appears to be a new position, and so the petitioner would not be in a position to meet this criterion. See *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(iii)(A)(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.

To the extent that they are depicted in the record, the duties do not appear so specialized and complex as to require the highly specialized knowledge associated with a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent,

in a specific specialty. Therefore, the evidence does not establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

As related in the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

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. The petition is denied.