U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

D2

[redacted]

FILE: SRC 03 011 50837 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 02 2004

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.

Marin Johnson

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

DISCUSSION: The director of the service center 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 engages in oil, gas, and geological formation exploration. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a digital systems technician/computer systems analyst. The petitioner, therefore, 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 beneficiary is not qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits the beneficiary's resume and employment verification letter.

Section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(2), states that an alien applying for classification as an H-1B nonimmigrant worker must possess full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation, and completion of the degree in the specialty that the occupation requires. If the alien does not possess the required degree, the petitioner must demonstrate that the alien has experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree, and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, an alien must meet one of the following criteria:

> *(1)* Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
>
> *(2)* Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
>
> *(3)* Hold an unrestricted state license, registration or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
>
> *(4)* Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation, and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains, in part: (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 entirely before issuing its decision.

In the Form I-129, the petitioner claimed to seek the beneficiary's services as a digital systems technician/computer systems analyst. Although not explicitly stated, it appears that the petitioner requires a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent in a computer-related field for the proffered position. In the June 11, 2003 letter submitted in response to the request to evidence, the petitioner indicated that it sought to hire the beneficiary as a software development technician; however, the associated duties described by the petitioner in this letter differed significantly from the duties described in the Form I-129. The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8). When responding to a request for evidence, a petitioner cannot offer a new position to the beneficiary, or materially change a position's title or its associated job responsibilities. The petitioner must establish that the position offered to the beneficiary is a specialty occupation. *See Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248, 249 (Reg. Comm. 1978). If significant changes are made to the initial request for approval, the petitioner must file a new petition rather than seek approval of a petition that is not supported by the facts in the record. Consequently, the AAO will disregard the position's title and description in the June 11, 2003 letter because it differed materially from the initial position in the Form I-129.

The director found that the beneficiary was not qualified for the proffered position because the beneficiary's education, experience, and training were not equivalent to a baccalaureate degree in a specialty required by the occupation. On appeal, counsel states that the beneficiary is qualified for the position because he has the equivalent of a bachelor's degree based on his education and experience.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform an occupation that requires a baccalaureate degree in a computer-related field. The beneficiary does not hold a baccalaureate degree from an accredited U.S. college or university in any field of study, or a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a baccalaureate degree from a U.S. college or university in any field of study. Therefore, the petitioner must demonstrate that the beneficiary meets the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(*4*).

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D), equating the beneficiary's credentials to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree shall be determined by one or more of the following:

(1) An evaluation from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience;

(2) The results of recognized college-level equivalency examinations or special credit programs, such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI);

(3) An evaluation of education by a reliable credentials evaluation service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials; or

(4) Evidence of certification or registration from a nationally-recognized professional

association or society for the specialty that is known to grant certification or registration to persons in the occupational specialty who have achieved a certain level of competence in the specialty;

(5) A determination by the Service that the equivalent of the degree required by the specialty occupation has been acquired through a combination of education, specialized training, and/or work experience in areas related to the specialty and that the alien has achieved recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation as a result of such training and experience.

There is no evidence in the record of proceeding that would satisfy any of the first four criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D). Consequently, CIS will consider the beneficiary's qualifications under the fifth criterion. When CIS determines an alien's qualifications pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5), three years of specialized training and/or work experience must be demonstrated for each year of college-level training the alien lacks. It must be clearly demonstrated that the alien's training and/or work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty occupation; that the alien's experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation; and that the alien has recognition of expertise in the specialty evidenced by at least one type of documentation such as:

(i) Recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation by at least two recognized authorities in the same specialty occupation[1];

(ii) Membership in a recognized foreign or United States association or society in the specialty occupation;

(iii) Published material by or about the alien in professional publications, trade journals, books, or major newspapers;

(iv) Licensure or registration to practice the specialty occupation in a foreign country; or

(v) Achievements which a recognized authority has determined to be significant contributions to the field of the specialty occupation.

The record of proceeding contains the beneficiary's resume, one employment letter, an educational evaluation from the International Education Consultants, and the beneficiary's transcripts and degree, as well as the translation into the English language of some of the documents. The evaluator found the beneficiary's

---

[1] *Recognized authority* means a person or organization with expertise in a particular field, special skills or knowledge in that field, and the expertise to render the type of opinion requested. A recognized authority's opinion must state: (1) the writer's qualifications as an expert; (2) the writer's experience giving such opinions, citing specific instances where past opinions have been accepted as authoritative and by whom; (3) how the conclusions were reached; and (4) the basis for the conclusions supported by copies or citations of any research material used. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

degree of higher technician in computer science from a Venezuelan university "equivalent of completion of three years of undergraduate study in Computer Science and related courses at a regionally accredited institution of higher education in the United States." The record of proceeding also contains one employment letter and the beneficiary's resume.

The submitted evidence fails to demonstrate that the alien's training and/or work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty occupation; that the alien's experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation; and that the alien has recognition of expertise in the specialty. The employment letter did not establish that the beneficiary's employment included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty. The employer does not describe the beneficiary's duties; it merely stated his position's title, programmer and systems technical support, and that the beneficiary has been employed with the company since March 1992. Thus, the AAO cannot conclude that the beneficiary's past work experience included the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, which in this case is programming, providing system updates, and troubleshooting hardware and the network. Furthermore, the employer does not indicate that the beneficiary's work experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation.

Finally, there is no evidence that the beneficiary has recognition of expertise. The AAO notes that the evaluator from International Education Consultants cannot be considered a "recognized authority" because the evaluator did not provide his qualifications as an expert; no resume or other evidence was attached to the evaluation. 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).

As related in the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO does not find that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. For this additional reason, the petition would be denied.

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.