



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 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536



File: SRC 01 256 52932 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JAN 27 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED


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, Texas Service Center, 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 tailor shop with an undisclosed number of employees and a gross annual income of \$147,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a fashion designer/dressmaker for a period of three years. The director denied the petition, because he determined that the petitioner had not established that the proffered position was a specialty occupation.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a statement. The petitioner asserts that a fashion designer/dressmaker is a specialty occupation due to the complexity of the responsibilities involved.

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), provides for the classification of qualified nonimmigrant aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation.

The issue to be discussed in this proceeding is whether the position offered to the beneficiary qualifies as 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.

The term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in field of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a 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.

In the original petition, the petitioner described the duties of the proffered position as including meeting with customers, designing clothes, creating patterns, making clothes, fitting and altering clothes, attending to dry cleaning customers, and closing business deals on behalf of the petitioner. The director asked for further information with regard to whether the proffered position was a specialty occupation. In response, the petitioner submitted an evaluation of the beneficiary's educational credentials. The director found the record did not establish that the offered position was a specialty occupation; thus, on June 20, 2002, the director denied the petition.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a letter stating that the proposed duties are so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree. The petitioner does not submit any other evidence on appeal.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has not articulated a sufficient basis for classifying the proffered position as a specialty occupation. In evaluating whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation, each of the four criteria listed at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) will be considered separately below.

I. A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position - 8 C.F.R. § 214.2 (h) (4) (iii) (A) (1)

Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) often looks to the Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* when determining whether a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into a particular position. The proffered position appears to correlate to the *Handbook's* description of a fashion designer. According to the 2002-2003 edition of the *Handbook* at page 121, fashion designers design and create garments. The *Handbook* does not state that an individual must have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent in order to enter this field.

To the extent that the *Handbook* does not indicate that employers of fashion designers or dressmakers require a bachelor's degree for entry into the proffered position, it does not appear that a bachelor's degree is the minimum requirement for entry into this field. Accordingly, the evidence does not support a finding that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the proffered position.

II. 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 - 8 C.F.R. § 214.1(h) (4) (iii) (A) (2)

A. Degree Requirement is Common to the Industry

Factors often considered by CIS when determining the industry standard 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." *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 *Handbook's* conclusions about a degree requirement for a fashion consultant's position were discussed above, and shall not be repeated here. The petitioner has not place on the

record any other information regarding industry standards; thus, this criterion has not been established.

B. Complexity and Uniqueness of the Proffered Position

In the alternative, the petitioner may show that the proffered position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree. In the instant petition, the petitioner has submitted no documentation that the proffered position would involve duties seen as either unique or complex that only an individual with a degree in a specific specialty could perform them.

III. The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position - 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3)

The petitioner did not submit any documentation with regard to other employees it has hired in similar positions.

IV. 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 - 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4)

To date the petitioner has placed no information on the record with regard to the specialized and complex nature of the proffered position. The job description in the original petition contains work duties that are similar to those of any fashion designer or dressmaker. No further documentation as to any specialized or complex duties within this description has been placed on the record. Without more persuasive evidence as to the specialized or complex nature of the fashion consultant, the petitioner has not met the fourth criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four criteria enumerated above are present in this proceeding. 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. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.