

PUBLIC COPY

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



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

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




File: WAC-02-194-53290

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **JAN 22 2004**

IN RE: Petitioner:
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:




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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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 and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is a staffing business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as an accountant. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a) 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 accountant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties in the record includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's May 24, 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: maintaining records of all warrants drawn and electronic funds transfers; examining accounts or papers related to the petitioner's fiscal business; processing payment and payroll accounting; reconciling and balancing monthly bank statements; preparing financial statements; drafting budget variance reports; maintaining financial records; and maintaining a ledger of fixed assets. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in accounting.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the job is not an accounting position; it is a financial record keeper position. Citing to the Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, 2002-2003 edition, 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).

On appeal, counsel states that the director has approved similar petitions with similar duties. Counsel also states that the

petitioner normally requires a baccalaureate or higher degree, as demonstrated by the petitioner's job announcement. Counsel additionally states that the degree requirement is industry wide, as demonstrated by the Internet job postings that have been submitted.

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.

First, the AAO does not agree with counsel's assertion that the beneficiary is a "corporate accountant," an occupation that would normally require a bachelor's degree in accounting or a related field. In its *Handbook* at page 21, the DOL describes the job of a management accountant as follows:

Management accountants - also called industrial, corporate or private accountants - record and analyze the financial information of the companies for which they work. . . . Usually, management accountants are part of executive teams involved in strategic planning or new-product development. . . . They also prepare financial reports for non-management groups, including stockholders, creditors, regulatory agencies, and tax authorities.

The record reflects that the petitioner, which is a staffing business, employs four persons and has a gross annual income of \$250,000. The business in which the beneficiary is to be employed does not require the services of a corporate accountant who is part of an executive decision-making team. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the position offered includes complex or advanced accounting duties such as the preparation of detailed financial reports for outside agencies or corporate stockholders, or that the position requires an individual with a knowledge of sophisticated accounting techniques normally associated with the duties of a corporate accountant.

The duties that the petitioner endeavors to have the beneficiary perform are the financial transaction reporting duties, which are similar to the duties that a bookkeeper or accounting clerk would execute in a small business establishment. In contrast to the description of an accountant, at page 390 of the *Handbook*, the DOL describes the positions of a bookkeeper and accounting clerk as follows:

In small establishments, *bookkeeping clerks* handle all financial transactions and recordkeeping. . . . More advanced accounting clerks may total, balance, and reconcile billing vouchers; ensure completeness and accuracy of data on accounts; and code documents, according to company procedures.

The types of duties the petitioner ascribes to the beneficiary fall within the scope of a bookkeeping or accounting clerk position rather than a management accounting position. For example, the petitioner states that the beneficiary will be responsible for performing general accounting, payroll accounting, and maintaining records of financial transactions. Bookkeeping, payroll, and routine accounts receivable and payable transactions are not duties normally associated with a corporate accountant. 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 shown that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specific specialty such as accounting, 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 job postings for accountant positions submitted by the petitioner are noted. 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. For example, one of the advertised positions is that of an accountant for the city of San Jose, and another advertised position is that of a financial/accounting professional at the corporate headquarters of a software business. The petitioner has not demonstrated that the complexity of the proffered position parallels the complexity of the advertised positions. Thus, the advertisements have little relevance. It is also noted that 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.

Second, counsel's assertion that CIS has already determined that the proffered position is a specialty occupation since CIS has approved other, similar petitions in the past is noted. This record of proceeding does not, however, contain all of the supporting evidence submitted to the California Service Center

in the prior cases. In the absence of all of the corroborating evidence contained in those records of proceeding, the documents submitted by counsel are not sufficient to enable the AAO to determine whether the other H-1B petitions were approved in error.

Each nonimmigrant petition is a separate proceeding with a separate record. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(d). In making a determination of statutory eligibility, the AAO is limited to the information contained in the record of proceeding. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(ii). Although the AAO may attempt to hypothesize as to whether the prior approvals were granted in error, no such determination may be made without review of the original records in their entirety. If the prior petitions were approved based on evidence that was substantially similar to the evidence contained in this record of proceeding that is now before the AAO, however, the approval of the prior petitions would have been erroneous. The AAO is not required to approve petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. See, e.g., *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I. & N. Dec. 593, 597 (Comm. 1988). Neither the AAO nor any other agency must treat acknowledged errors as binding precedent. *Sussex Engg. Ltd. v. Montgomery* 825 F.2d 1084, 1090 (6th Cir. 1987), cert denied, 485 U.S. 1008 (1988).

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. The job fits the description of a bookkeeper or accounting clerk, rather than an accountant. According to the DOL at pages 387-388 of the *Handbook*, the usual requirement for a bookkeeping or accounting clerk is a high school diploma or its equivalent. A higher level of training is favored but not required, and such training is available in community colleges or schools of business. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

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.