D2

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: EAC 02 202 52580 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: NOV 15 2006

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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:

[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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and rejected a subsequent appeal reasoning that the G-28 was not properly signed. Upon receipt of a motion to reconsider, the director determined that the appeal should not have been rejected, as the individual who signed the G-28 owns 50 percent of the petitioning entity. 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 an exporter of meat and poultry that seeks to employ the beneficiary as an accounting consultant. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to § 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)(l) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(l), 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; (5) Form I-290B and supporting documentation; (6) the director's rejection letter; (7) the petitioner's motion to reconsider; and (8) the director's decision reversing its decision to reject the appeal,

and forwarding it to the AAO for consideration of the denial. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as an accounting consultant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's May 22, 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 prospective transactions through the calculation of projected revenues, expenses, and profits; analyzing interest rate fluctuations; preparing and analyzing financial statements; forecasting international trends in the meat and poultry industry; examining and analyzing prospective transactions to expand the petitioner's distribution network; maintaining financial books and records; preparing financial statements and tax submissions; analyzing and forecasting the petitioner's growth; assessing the petitioner's current and projected financial position; and compiling and recording financial data to prepare entries to the general ledger and accounts. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in accounting, finance, or business administration.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the proposed duties are not so complex as to require a baccalaureate degree. 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, in part, that the proposed duties, which include managing accounting transactions with the petitioner's domestic and international customers, are more complex than bookkeeping functions. Counsel submits an opinion from Mr. Arturo Bris, a professor and business consultant, in support of his assertion that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

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. The AAO does not concur with counsel that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. It is noted that, in the petitioner's May 22, 2002 letter, the petitioner's vice president states that the petitioner has 10 employees and is expanding its operations. The record, however, contains no evidence of such expansion. Furthermore, although the petitioner's vice president states that the petitioner has 10 employees, its 2001 federal tax return reflects only $64,974 paid in salaries and wages and $30,700 paid in compensation of officers. The record, however, contains no explanation for this inconsistency. It is incumbent upon the petitioner

to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Upon a thorough review of the record, the proffered position appears to be primarily that of a bookkeeper. No evidence in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a bookkeeper job.

On appeal, counsel submits an opinion from [redacted] Assistant Professor of Finance at Yale University, who asserts, in part, that positions such as the proffered position require a bachelor's-level educational and/or professional background in business administration, or a related area. The record also contains an opinion from [redacted] of The Zicklin School of Business Administration at Baruch College, The City University of New York, who asserts, in part, that positions such as the proffered position require a bachelor's degree in accounting, or a related field. Neither [redacted] however, provides any evidence in support of their assertions. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the record contains a variety of Internet job postings for accountant positions. 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, therefore, has 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. As the record indicates that the proffered position is a new position, the petitioner, therefore, has not established the criterion set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(*3*).

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(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 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.