



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D-2

[Redacted]

FILE: LIN 03 086 54399 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUL 20 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]

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
for Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

RECEIVED
JUL 20 2004
U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES
WASHINGTON, DC 20529

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 home healthcare facility. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a quality assurance coordinator, and endeavors to classify her 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 states that the proffered position does qualify as 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 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), provides, in part, for the classification of qualified nonimmigrant aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation.

Section 214(i)(1) of 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:

[A]n 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 are 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 proceedings 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 with supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary’s services as a quality assurance coordinator. Evidence of the beneficiary’s duties was set forth in the I-129 petition and the petitioner’s letter in support of the petition. The petitioner’s nurse recruiter described the duties of the proffered position as follows in her letter of January 8, 2003: “The [q]uality [a]ssurance [c]oordinator will assess [the] level of care and services rendered.” The director requested a more detailed job description in his request for evidence. Counsel was unresponsive to the director’s request in this regard, however, when responding to the request for evidence. The record of proceeding does not contain any additional information about the duties of the offered position.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. The AAO routinely consults the U.S. Department of Labor’s *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* for information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The duties of the proffered position are presented in such vague and generic terms, however, that it is impossible to determine what tasks the beneficiary would perform on a daily basis, or the complexity of the tasks to be performed. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to describe the duties of the proffered position in such detail as to permit an analysis of the day-to-day functions to be performed by the beneficiary. This, the petitioner has failed to do. As such, it cannot be determined whether: a baccalaureate or higher degree is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the offered position; a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel position among similar organizations; the duties of the offered position are so complex or unique that they can be performed by an individual with a degree; or 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 the offered position meets the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1), (2), or (4). The petitioner does not assert that it normally requires a degree in a specific specialty for the offered position, and offers no evidence in this regard. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3). As such, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

Beyond the director’s decision, it is not clear whether the petitioner named on the petition actually filed the Form I-129 in this case. The Form I-129 was signed by an individual in the capacity of “nurse recruiter”

rather than as an employee or representative of the petitioning entity. A letter dated January 8, 2003 in support of the I-129 petition was signed by the nurse recruiter. If the individual who signed the petition and supporting documentation is the actual employer, then this information should be accurately reflected on the Form I-129, the underlying certified Labor Condition Application, and the supporting documentation. If this individual is an agent acting on behalf of the petitioner, then there is no evidence in the record that she has been authorized to act for, or in the place of, the employer as its agent. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F). It is unclear who the actual employer is. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Accordingly, it is unclear whether the petitioner listed on the Form I-129 meets the definition of a U.S. employer under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). 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 failed to sustain that burden and the appeal shall accordingly be dismissed.

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