



PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent identity and warranted
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



JAN 22 2004


File: LIN-02-254-54224 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date:

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 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 travel services business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a market research analyst. 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 and the beneficiary is not qualified to perform a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

The AAO will first address the director's conclusion that the position is not a specialty occupation.

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 market research analyst. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties in the record includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's August 5, 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: collecting and analyzing reports regarding customers and products; surveying customers for effective marketing; studying cost effectiveness of marketing methods; and reviewing marketing techniques of competitors and interpreting marketing trends. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in business administration.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the petitioner had not demonstrated that the beneficiary would be performing the duties of a specialty occupation. 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 proposed duties, which include collecting and analyzing data, are those of a market research analyst. Counsel further states that it submitted job advertisements in support of his claim.

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 (DOL) *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 that of a market research analyst.

The first reason why the AAO is not persuaded to classify the offered position as a marketing analyst/market research analyst position concerns the particular duties of the offered position compared with the duties of a typical market research analyst position. At page 239 of the *Handbook*, 2002-2003 edition, the DOL states: "[m]arket, or marketing, research analysts are concerned with the potential sales of a product or service. They analyze statistical data on past sales to predict future sales. . . ." In this case, although the proffered position requires some market analysis, the duties described by the petitioner are primarily those of a marketing manager for reasons that will be discussed herein.

The second reason why the AAO is not persuaded to classify the offered position as a market research analyst position relates to the type of industry in which the beneficiary would be employed. Information in the *Handbook*, at page 240, provides insight into the types of industries in which market research analysts are normally found. According to the DOL:

Private industry provided about 9 out of 10 jobs for salaried workers, particularly economic and marketing research firms, management consulting firms, banks, securities and commodities brokers, and computer and data processing companies.

Although the list of private industry employers is not all inclusive, the DOL's description of a market research analyst's job implies that these types of positions are found within large firms or corporations, such as banks or worldwide pharmaceutical companies.

The record indicates that the petitioner, which is a travel services business, has 11 employees and a gross annual income of \$2,243,119. The business of market research for a travel services business is not within the DOL's list of industries that typically require the services of a full-time individual who performs only market research analyst duties. For these reasons, the AAO is not persuaded to label the offered position as a market research analyst position.

An analysis of the beneficiary's proposed duties reveals that the job being offered is similar to the job of a marketing manager. In its *Handbook* at page 27, the DOL describes the job of a marketing manager, in part, as follows:

Marketing managers develop the firm's detailed marketing strategy. . . . [T]hey determine the demand for products and services offered by the firm and its competitors. In addition, they identify potential markets. . . . Marketing managers develop pricing strategy with an eye towards maximizing the firm's share of the market and its profits while ensuring that the firm's customers are satisfied. . . . [T]hey monitor trends that indicate the need for new products and services and oversee product development

A review of the DOL's *Handbook* at page 28 finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty for employment in marketing managerial jobs. A wide range of educational backgrounds is suitable, but many employers prefer those with experience in related occupations plus a broad liberal arts background. In addition, most marketing management positions are filled by promoting experienced staff or related professional or technical personnel. In highly technical industries, such as computer and electronics manufacturing, a bachelor's degree in

engineering or science, combined with a master's degree in business administration, is preferred. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for market research 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. 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).

Counsel asserts that Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) has already determined that the proffered position is a specialty occupation since CIS has approved other, similar petitions in the past. 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 entireties. 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).

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. On appeal, counsel states that the petitioner submitted an organization chart to demonstrate that individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees have been employed in the past. Other than the proffered position, however, none of the positions on the petitioner's organization chart is a market research analyst position. Furthermore, the record does not contain any evidence of the petitioner's past hiring practices and therefore, 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).

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion 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 director also found that the beneficiary would not be qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position if the job had been determined to be a specialty occupation. However, as the AAO is dismissing the appeal because the job is not a specialty occupation, it will not discuss the beneficiary's qualifications.

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.