identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

D2

[redacted]

FILE: SRC 04 013 50229 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 29 2004

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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)

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.

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 auto dealership that seeks to employ the beneficiary as an accountant. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to § 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)(l) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(l), 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) the petitioner's motion to reconsider. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as an accountant. 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: compiling, examining, and analyzing all financial records; preparing financial statements; and producing financial reports and other budgetary data. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in accounting, business administration, or a related field.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because 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 proffered position is so complex and unique that it can be performed only by an individual with an accounting degree. Counsel states further that the petitioner submitted documentation to demonstrate that it normally requires such a degree and that the degree requirement is industry wide. Counsel also states that the record additionally contains an expert opinion as supporting documentation.

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. CIS looks beyond the title of the position and determines, from a review of the duties of the position and any supporting evidence, whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act. The AAO does not concur with counsel that the proffered position is that of an accountant. The petitioning entity states that it is an auto dealership with two employees and a gross annual income of $723,000. The petitioner claims that it will employ the beneficiary as a full-time accountant. The *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, indicates that management accountants are usually part of executive teams involved in strategic planning or new-product development. Public accountants are generally self-employed or work for accounting firms. In this case, although there may be elements of an accountant's duties in the proffered position, the majority of the position description primarily parallels that of a bookkeeper or accounting clerk. No evidence in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a bookkeeper or accounting clerk.

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for accountants. 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. One of the positions is that of a portfolio accountant in the banking industry, and another position is that of an associate accountant for a

mutual fund company. The petitioner has not demonstrated that the proffered position is as complex as these advertised positions. It is additionally noted that although the advertisement for the restaurant accountant indicates that "a college degree" is required, it does not specify the requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty. Thus, the advertisements have little relevance.

The record also contains an evaluation from Dr. H. S. Hayre, Director of C.E.I.E. Specialists, Inc., who asserts, in part, that the proffered position requires a bachelor's degree in accounting. Dr. Hayre, however, does not provide any evidence in support of his assertion. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

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, therefore, has 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. As the record indicates that the proffered position is a new position, the petitioner has not met its burden of proof in this regard. *See Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). Furthermore, counsel's October 30, 2003 letter indicates that the petitioner formerly outsourced its accounting work to an individual with an associate's degree in accounting.

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(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.

Beyond the decision of the director, the record does not contain an explanation for the variations of the beneficiary's surname as it appears on various documents in the record; on some documents it appears as Odeh and in others Owda. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

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.