



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Administrative Appeals Office
California Service Center
San Francisco, CA 94108

Handwritten initials or mark.

[Redacted]

FILE: WAC 03 181 50252 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: 01/11/07

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

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 an airline charter services company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an aircraft test engineer, and endeavors to classify him 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 additional information stating that the proffered position qualifies 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 fields 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 an aircraft test engineer. Evidence of the beneficiary’s duties includes the Form I-129 petition with attachment, and the petitioner’s response to the director’s request for evidence. According to the evidence, the beneficiary would: (30 percent of the time) analyze, plan, develop, and conduct tests on aircraft components, products, and systems; (25 percent of the time) evaluate aircraft components, products and operational systems, and recommend design modifications or repair to eliminate causes of malfunctions and/or aircraft engine or systems failures; (25 percent of the time) evaluate and recommend changes in engines or systems requirements in order to ensure that airplanes function properly and efficiently with special emphasis on aircraft; and (20 percent of the time) use computer assisted engineering and design software and equipment to perform various aircraft engineering tasks. The petitioner requires a bachelor’s degree in engineering or a related discipline for entry into the proffered 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 precisely what tasks the beneficiary would perform on a daily basis, or the complexity of the tasks to be performed. For example, the petitioner indicates that the beneficiary would: analyze, plan, develop, and conduct tests on aircraft components and systems; evaluate aircraft components and systems and recommend design modifications to repair or eliminate causes of malfunctions; and evaluate and recommend changes in engines or systems requirements. It is impossible to ascertain from these generic descriptions of duties precisely what tasks the beneficiary will perform and the complexity of those tasks. The beneficiary could be performing basic maintenance and mechanical functions in conducting tests on aircraft components/systems, evaluating components/systems and recommending modifications, and evaluating and recommending changes in engines or systems requirements. The work could also be far more complex requiring the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. It should be noted, however, that it is difficult to imagine what aircraft design modifications an engineer would make in employment for a company that provides airline charter services. Be that as it may, 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 is impossible to determine 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 positions among similar organizations; the duties of the offered position are so complex or unique that they can only be performed by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty; or knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty. 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).

The proffered position does not meet any of the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Accordingly, the director's denial of the Form I-129 petition shall not be disturbed.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner had not proved that the position was a specialty occupation, citing the *Handbook's* requirements for airframe mechanics, power plant mechanics, and avionics repair specialists. The petitioner objects to the director's interpretation of its job duties as an aircraft mechanic. It is noted, nevertheless, that the *Handbook* indicates that most aircraft engineers work in the product and parts manufacturing industries, the federal government, research and development, and navigational, measuring, electromedical, and control instruments manufacturing industry firms. The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary will be coming to the United States to perform services in the specialty occupation of an aircraft test engineer as required by 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

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.