

identifying data related to  
prevent clear, unobstructed  
invasion of personal privacy


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

**PUBLIC COPY**



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

D2



FILE: EAC 02 294 54303 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date FEB 22 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, 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 a hotel that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a marketing manager. 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 and additional evidence, including the petitioner's 2002 U.S. Return of Partnership Income and a letter from the petitioner with a revised, more complex description of duties.

The petitioner's revised, more complex description of duties is noted. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) regulations, however, affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12). A petitioner cannot materially change a position's title or its associated job responsibilities after the filing of the petition. 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, as have occurred here, the petitioner must file a new petition rather than seek approval of a petition that is not supported by the facts in the record. As such, for the purposes of this proceeding, the proposed duties of the proffered position are those that are described in the petitioner's September 19, 2002 letter.

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 marketing manager. Evidence of the beneficiary’s duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner’s September 19, 2002 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner’s response to the director’s request for evidence. According to the petitioner’s September 19, 2002 letter, the beneficiary would perform the following duties:

[T]he beneficiary will be responsible for duties with respect to finance and marketing departments. Her duties will require a demonstration of innovation, communication skills and managerial acumen. She will be expected to provide a natural, organizational management instinct to her work functions. She will be expected to approach the work assigned to her in a professional manner, setting priorities and carefully delegating the tasks to meet deadlines reflecting the same. Among her abilities will be the capacity to communicate effectively with her colleagues and supervisors helping her to succeed in her management tasks. She will also be required to possess excellent leadership skills. Among her responsibilities will be to exercise analytical and logical thinking leading to a beneficial decision making process. She will be required to create and establish an infrastructure of inter-organizational management information system between offices having multiple activity types. She will be expected to have excellent written and oral communication skills, manifested through her interactions with peers and supervisors and in the projects prepared and handled during various assignments.

The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor’s degree in a relevant field.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because 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 proffered position is that of a marketing manager. Counsel states further that the Department of Labor’s *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* indicates that a specific type of degree is required for a marketing manager position.

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)).

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 that of a marketing manager or that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. A review of the proposed duties, which include delegating tasks and creating and establishing an "infrastructure of inter-organizational management information system," indicates that the proffered position is primarily that of an office and administrative support worker supervisor or manager. No evidence in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for an office and administrative support worker supervisor or manager. Furthermore, the petitioner's organizational hierarchy is unclear. The record contains no evidence that the petitioning entity comprises various departments, such as finance and marketing departments, as mentioned in the proposed duties, and it is not clear to whom the beneficiary would be delegating tasks or the nature of such delegated tasks. In addition, it is not clear with what supervisors the beneficiary would be communicating or that such activities would require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. 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).

The record does not include any evidence regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry. 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 criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(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.

EAC 02 294 54303

Page 5

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.