

Administrative Appeals Office  
Division of Service



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

NOT TO COPY



DA

JUN 01 2005

FILE: [Redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

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:

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.

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 employee leasing services company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a marketing specialist. The petitioner 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 proffered position is not a specialty occupation and the petitioner had not complied with the terms of previously approved petitions. On appeal, the petitioner submits a statement.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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 specialist. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's September 25, 2003 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: developing marketing strategies to solicit new accounts for the business; drafting and preparing outgoing correspondence to prospective clients regarding the scope of services, fees, referrals and contracts; working with the finance officer and management to establish annual budget based on service projection and profit margins; and assisting in the development and implementation of the company's established policy and procedures. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in business administration, marketing, management, or a related field.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation.

On appeal, the petitioner states that the director denied the petition based on a speculated link between the petitioner and █████ Enterprises and its subsidiaries. The petitioner claims that it has no current association with any other organization. The petitioner also states that it has not filed more than 350 petitions as the director alleged, but instead has filed 120 petitions, with 13 approvals. The petitioner states that some people on the list of approved H-1B beneficiaries it submitted in response to the director's request for evidence have not yet entered the United States. The petitioner asserts that there is a bona fide position for the beneficiary to fill.

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. CIS looks beyond the title of the position and determines, from a review of the duties of the position and any supporting evidence, whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.

The proffered position is similar to a marketing manager. The 2004-2005 edition of the *Handbook* describes educational requirements for entry into the marketing manager field:

A wide range of educational backgrounds is suitable for entry into advertising, marketing, promotions, public relations, and sales managerial jobs, but many employers prefer those with experience in related occupations plus a broad liberal arts background. A bachelor's degree in sociology, psychology, literature, journalism, or philosophy, among other subjects, is acceptable. However, requirements vary, depending upon the particular job.

For marketing, sales, and promotions management positions, some employers prefer a bachelor's or master's degree in business administration with an emphasis on marketing.

This clearly indicates that a marketing manager is not a specialty occupation, since there is no requirement for a degree in a specific specialty for entry into this field. A wide range of areas of study would be appropriate preparation for a position as a sales or marketing manager, with only some employers preferring a specific specialty. As noted above, 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 Act defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires "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." Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1). (Emphasis added).

The petitioner submitted no evidence regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's client'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 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. There is no evidence in the record regarding the petitioner's client's past hiring practices. In *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000), the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now CIS, reasonably interpreted the statute and the regulations when it required the petitioner to show that the entities ultimately employing the foreign nurses require a bachelor's degree for all employees in that position. The court found that the degree requirement should not originate with the employment agency that brought the nurses to the United States for employment with the agency's clients.

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.

Regarding the petitioner's assertion that the director's decision was based on its connection to another company, the AAO notes that the director found that the position was not a specialty occupation. While the director did note that the petitioner's parent (or prior parent) company appeared to have a history of suspicious filing practices, the decision was not based on this relationship. In addition, while the petitioner states on appeal that it has no current association with any other organization, it does not address any past associations. The petitioner's status at the time the petition was filed is the status that would be relevant to any adjudication. Nonetheless, as noted, the director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation, independent of any questions regarding the petitioner's business relationships with other companies.

An H-1B alien is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(ii)(B). In this case, the petitioner did not establish that the beneficiary would be coming to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation.

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.