


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services




M

FILE: WAC 03 069 51538 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 09 2005

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.

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 oriental/antique rug wholesaler and retailer that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a part-time accountant. 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)(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; 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 part-time accountant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's December 16, 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: preparing quarterly and yearly tax records, payroll statements and deductions, monthly profit-and-loss reports, and financial statements; directing the implementation of a general accounting system for keeping accounts and records of disbursements, expenses, tax payments, and general ledgers; preparing balance sheets reflecting company assets, liabilities, and capital; performing audits and reports; devising a long-range tax plan and recommending ways to reduce taxes; advising and recommending tax strategies; devising a financial system that will allow for more systematic and smoother inventory procedures; monitoring budgeting, performance evaluation, and costs-and-assets management; and analyzing transactions and preparing billing statements. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in accounting, or an equivalent thereof.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the job is not an accountant position; it is a bookkeeping, accounting, or auditing clerk position. Citing to the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, 2002-2003 edition, 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, which already employs an accountant, 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 proffered position, which entails analyzing, interpreting, advising, and planning duties, is an accountant, and is not a bookkeeping, accounting, or auditing clerk position. Counsel states further that the petitioner has established a pattern of hiring accountants with the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in accounting, as the petitioner already has a full-time H-1B accountant on staff.

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. Minn. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

In this case, information on the petition reflects that the petitioner is a rug wholesaler and retailer with three employees and a gross annual income of \$503,000. Although the director points out in his decision that the petitioner has not demonstrated that its operations are of the scale and complexity to require the services of the full-time accountant who is already on its staff, let alone the proffered part-time accountant, counsel does not address this issue on appeal. Rather, counsel asserts that the proffered position entails the complex duties of an accountant. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). It is also noted that the proposed duties

described above overlap the duties that are described on the petitioner's "list of employees" for its full-time accountant: "cash flow and budgetary projections; inventory control analysis; financial statement analysis; audit and tax matters; and consultation services." Furthermore, upon review of the proposed duties, it is not clear how the beneficiary could realistically perform such duties as implementing a general accounting system when the petitioner already has a full-time accountant on staff. Accordingly, it is unclear what duties the beneficiary would actually perform. 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). Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988). Furthermore, responsibility for the financial transactions described above differs vastly from responsibility associated with a far larger income or from a firm that is responsible for the accounting work of many clients. Consequently, the petitioner fails to establish that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position.

The duties described in the *Handbook* do not primarily apply to the proffered position. According to the *Handbook*, accountants prepare financial reports for nonmanagement groups, including stockholders, creditors, regulatory agencies, and tax authorities, and usually, they are part of executive teams. The beneficiary will not be part of an executive team. Nor will the beneficiary prepare financial reports for nonmanagement groups such as stockholders, creditors, regulatory agencies, and tax authorities. Given this significant dissimilarity, the scope and complexity of the beneficiary's duties and responsibilities do not rise to the level of an accountant. Consequently, a bachelor's degree in accounting or a related field – which the DOL states is required for a management accountant – would not be required for the proffered position. A review of the *Handbook* finds that the proposed duties are primarily the duties bookkeeping, accounting, auditing and financial clerks. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for these positions.

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for accountants. These job postings, however, are not convincing evidence that the position of an accountant is a specialty occupation in this case, based on the discrepancies discussed above.

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. On appeal, counsel states that the employer has a full-time accountant on staff with the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in accounting and, thus, has established a pattern of hiring accountants with the equivalent of a bachelor's degree. The record, however, does not contain any evidence of the petitioner's past hiring practices and, therefore, the petitioner has not met its burden of proof in this regard. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

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.