



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



DZ

FILE: LIN 02 275 54242 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 28 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:
[Redacted]

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.

for 
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 a horse training and breeding business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as an assistant equine manager. 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 an assistant equine manager. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's August 27, 2002 letter in support of the

petition; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to this evidence, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail: managing staff that provides horse care; supervising veterinary care and handling record keeping of 21 horses; providing daily riding lessons; training horses from "green broke" to Grand Prix level; communicating with clients and assisting with marketing duties; evaluating horse prospects; coaching riders at competitions; and assisting with stallion breeding and mare insemination. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in equine studies or an equivalent thereof.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the proposed duties are not so complex that a baccalaureate degree is required. 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).

On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the sport of dressage requires years of training, and the petitioner's owners have combined experience of 55 years of training and competing professionally in the field of dressage. Counsel further states that the director ignored the expert opinions from Professor Jack Riley, Head of the Department of Animal Sciences of Kansas State University and Sheila Schils, Ph.D., who state that the beneficiary [employed by the petitioner in J-1 status] is performing at the level of an individual in an H-1 specialty occupation. Counsel additionally states that the record contains examples of coursework for bachelor degree programs in equestrian management as further evidence that a bachelor's degree is a requirement for entry into the field.

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 Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (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 a specialty occupation. It is noted that the description of proposed duties in the petitioner's August 27, 2002 letter includes complex duties related to animal husbandry, such as assisting with stallion breeding and mare insemination. The literature submitted pertaining to the petitioner's business, however, indicates that it is primarily engaged in horse training and rider instruction. The record contains no evidence that the petitioner is engaged in the breeding of horses. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and, attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies will

not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). 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). A review of the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, finds that although some animal trainers, such as a marine mammal trainer, may require a bachelor's degree, most animal care and service workers are trained on the job. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

It is noted that the expert opinion letters relate to the beneficiary's qualifications and therefore will not be discussed further.

The record does not include any evidence regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry or from professional associations regarding an industry standard. Nor does the record include any 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. Counsel's statement that the petitioner's owners have combined experience of 55 years in the equestrian field is noted. The record, however, does not contain any evidence of the petitioner's past hiring practices for an assistant equine manager position and therefore, the petitioner has not met its burden of proof in this regard. *See Matter of Treasure Craft of California, id.*

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.

The petitioner submits examples of various curricula for a baccalaureate program in equestrian management as further evidence that a bachelor's degree is a requirement for entry into the field. The AAO cannot assume, however, that the additional training that the baccalaureate program provides is solely related to the alleged complexity of the proffered position. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient to meet the burden of proof in this proceeding. *See Matter of Treasure Craft of California, id.*

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.