

D2

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




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



FILE: SRC 01 201 52833 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

SEP 03 2004

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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

R Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to
prevent clear unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition, and the petitioner filed an appeal. As the appeal was filed untimely, the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) withdrew the director's decision and remanded the matter to her for consideration of the appeal as a motion. The director ordered that the petition remain denied and certified her decision to the AAO for review. The decision of the director will be affirmed.

The petitioner is a law office that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a legal assistant and foreign legal 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. Counsel has not submitted any additional information in response to the director's notice of certification.

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.

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 AAO's decision to remand the matter to the director for consideration as a motion; and (7) the director's decision affirming the denial of the

petition and certifying her decision to the AAO for review. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a legal assistant and foreign legal consultant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's May 23, 2001 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: researching foreign law; investigating facts; preparing documents; directing and coordinating activities of the law office employees; directing research surveys on legal matters; maintaining client records; and preparing informative materials for presentation to the English and Spanish speaking public. Although not explicitly stated, it appears that the petitioner requires a juris doctor degree or its U.S. equivalent for the proffered position.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because it is primarily that of a paralegal or legal assistant. Citing to the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, the director noted that the minimum requirement for entry into the position was not a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. 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).

In his statement submitted on appeal, counsel states that CIS has approved other, similar petitions. Counsel also states that a review of the *Handbook* finds that some paralegal programs award a bachelor's degree upon completion.

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 *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. No evidence in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a paralegal or legal assistant job.

Counsel's observation that some paralegal programs award a bachelor's degree upon completion is noted. The AAO cannot assume, however, that the additional training that the baccalaureate program provides is solely related to the alleged complexity of the proffered position. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient to meet the burden of proof in this proceeding. See *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, counsel asserts 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, however, does not contain all of the supporting evidence submitted to the service center in the prior cases. If the other nonimmigrant petitions were approved based on identical facts that are contained in the current record, those approvals would be in violation of paragraph (h) of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2, and would constitute material and gross error on the part of the director. The AAO is not required to approve applications or 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). It would be absurd to suggest that CIS or any 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).

In the absence of all of the corroborating evidence contained in those records of proceeding, the information submitted by counsel is not sufficient to enable the AAO to determine whether the other H-1B petitions were parallel to the proffered position.

The record does not include any evidence regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry or from professional associations regarding an industry standard. Nor does the record include any 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. As counsel did not address this issue on appeal, it will not be discussed further.

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 director's orders denying this petition are affirmed.