



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[Handwritten mark]

[Redacted]

FILE: WAC 02 271 52203 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 27 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]

PUBLIC COPY

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

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.

Robert P. Wiemann

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 dental office that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a dental specialist/researcher. 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 and other documentation.

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 dental specialist/researcher. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's undated 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: developing ways for the staff to increase productivity; overseeing billing; following up on orders with dental laboratories; preparing reports on patients' conditions for dentists; suggesting solutions to patients' dental problems; and researching dental literature to assist the dentist in the treatment of specific cases. The petitioner requires candidates for the job to possess a graduate degree in dental medicine.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation. Citing to the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* the director likened the instant position to that of a combination of a dental assistant and office manager. The director noted that the minimum requirement for entry into either of these fields 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).

On appeal, counsel appears to equate the proffered position to that of a combination of a medical scientist and a medical facility manager. Counsel states that such a position requires a doctorate in dentistry. Counsel also asserts that the degree requirement is common to the industry for parallel positions.

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 medical scientist or researcher or medical facility manager. None of the beneficiary's job duties entails the scope or level of responsibility of either occupation.

The duties of the proffered position appear to be focused on individual patient diagnosis and care. The research involved, consisting of reviewing patients' records and reading dental literature, is the type of research done by dentists and their staff in order to treat patients. This is not the type of research contemplated by the *Handbook* or the submitted job announcements in reference to the researcher positions. The dental literature the beneficiary would read, in fact, publishes the work of the medical and dental scientists conducting studies in laboratories and clinical facilities. There is no information on record to indicate that this is the type of work to be performed in the proffered position.

The AAO finds that the administrative duties of the proffered position most closely resemble those of an administrative services manager, as described in the *Handbook*. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for an administrative services manager job.

The duties which allegedly require a doctorate in dentistry are described in such vague terms as to make it impossible to determine the purpose of employing a non-licensed dentist to assist the licensed dentist in diagnosing patients and suggesting solutions to the patients' conditions. The record does not describe how the beneficiary, without the benefit of actually seeing the patient, could provide the licensed practitioner with superior diagnoses or suggestions for treatment. The evidence on the record regarding this apparent anomaly is insufficient to alter the director's assessment that the dental duties of the position could be performed by an experienced dental assistant.

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for medical researchers. 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. Indeed, they appear to be very different. Thus, 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 is a new position; thus, the record does not contain any evidence of the petitioner's past hiring practices.

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.