



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



FILE: WAC 02 212 53319 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: *JUN 22 2006*

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 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.

*Mari Johnson*

*for* Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

*Administrative Appeals Office  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Department of Homeland Security*

**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 company that distributes nuclear-related products and seeks to employ the beneficiary as a business analyst. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary 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 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 a business analyst. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's May 17, 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: analyzing data collected; making recommendations on pricing and purchasing strategies; analyzing and studying the petitioner's operational procedures to identify problems, so as to reduce duplicate workloads and eliminate nonessential jobs; estimating and controlling manufacturing costs and operational expenses; evaluating financial and statistical data to estimate capital expenditures; analyzing data collected and recommending materials planning, production control and shipment schedules; monitoring budget plans by reviewing reports and accounting records to determine if allocated funds were spent as specified; and assisting management in approving the budget. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in a business-related subject.

The director found that the petitioner had not established that the proffered position was 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 petitioner established that a bachelor's degree is required for entry in to the proffered position and that the nature of the duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with attaining a bachelor's degree.

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. While counsel is correct in stating that the *Handbook* indicates that a degree in a specific specialty is required for a business analyst position, the petitioner has not provided enough detail to establish that the beneficiary would actually be working as a business analyst. Portions of the position description are described in almost exactly the same terms as used in the *Handbook*, and therefore, the petitioner has not shown how its business would specifically use a business analyst or what the beneficiary would do in that position.

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

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 employed an individual as a business analyst from June 1992 through July 1993, and that that person possessed an MBA degree. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Also on appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner's owners had been sharing the duties of the proffered position, that both of them hold bachelor's degrees and now "see the need for a Business Analyst to take over the duties." Counsel states that the regulations do not require the petitioner to establish that it has actually hired individuals with bachelor's degrees to perform the proffered position, but only that the person performing the duties is required to possess a bachelor's degree. As discussed above, there is no evidence that the petitioner has ever employed a business analyst since its inception in 1972. Although counsel claims that the owners of the business have been performing the duties of the position and hold bachelor's degrees, there is no evidence that their bachelor's degrees are in the specialty occupation, or that each one is fully performing the duties of a business analyst rather than splitting the duties according to their respective abilities, education, and training. In short, this appears to be a newly-created position and there is no evidence that the petitioner normally requires a bachelor's or higher degree in the specialty occupation. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established the criterion set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(iii)(A)(3).

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 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. As noted above, the position description lacks detail about how the beneficiary would perform this position; 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 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.