


PUBLIC COPY



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

D2




FILE: WAC 01 262 60633 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 03 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:



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

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 trade and transportation company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as marketing director. 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 and other documentation.

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 marketing director. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes the I-129 petition and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to this evidence, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail supervising the development and production of advertising materials and evaluating and developing marketing programs. The petitioner

indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor of science degree or its equivalent in an unspecified field.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the job is not an industrial engineering position; it is an engineering technician position. The director noted that the petitioner failed to specify a required educational background on the Employment Development Department Prevailing Wage Request Form. The director also found that the job description on the record was vague, and 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 proffered position should be approved, because previously filed petitions for similar positions were approved. Counsel also maintains that the job description is sufficiently detailed for CIS to make a determination regarding whether it is a specialty occupation. Upon review of the record, however, 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.

Regarding 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, this record of proceeding does not contain all of the supporting evidence submitted to the 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 position offered in the prior cases were similar to the position in the instant petition.

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, CIS 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 cases were similar to the proffered position or was approved 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, however, the approval of the prior petitions would have been erroneous. CIS 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 CIS 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).

A review of the job description provided reveals that the director's assessment to the effect that it is generic and vague is correct. On appeal, counsel asserts that the description is detailed, but no further clarification regarding the beneficiary's day-to-day duties is provided. The AAO also notes that, in any case, the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* reports that numerous fields of study provide a suitable background for entry into the field of marketing. A preference on the part of some employers for a specific degree, such as one in business administration with a major in marketing, does not mean that this is a minimum requirement for entry into the field.

The record does not contain any evidence to support any of the four criteria listed at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4), therefore, the proffered position cannot be considered to be a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

WAC 01 262 60633

Page 4

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.