

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

D2




FILE: LIN 04 065 51776 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 15 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 wholesale distributor in the automotive supply industry that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a business development analyst. 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 does not qualify as a specialty occupation, and because the beneficiary is not qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. On appeal, the petitioner submits a brief and additional information stating that the offered position qualifies as a specialty occupation and that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

The first issue to be discussed in this proceeding is whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), provides, in part, for the classification of qualified nonimmigrant aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation.

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.

The term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

[A]n occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a 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 are 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) the 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) the Form I-290B with supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a business development analyst. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes the Form I-129 petition with attachment, the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence, and its motion to reopen and reconsider. According to this evidence the beneficiary would:

- Devise methods and procedures for the company to grow and expand by exploring new markets, new products, and acquisitions;
- Increase the company's world trade and market access by incorporating the knowledge of business administration and economics to the business development plan;
- Direct the development, management and analysis of the business database;
- Identify major markets for the company's products, including automotive supplies, via market analysis; and
- Coordinate the business development activities of the company to assure growth, product/service development.

The petitioner requires a minimum of a bachelor's degree in economics or a related business field for entry into the proffered position.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the offered position, or that a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, as asserted by the

petitioner. Factors often considered by CIS when determining these criteria include: whether the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether an industry 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 information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. Though vaguely described, the duties of the proffered position appear to fall within those noted for advertising, marketing, promotions, public relations, and sales managers, not market research analysts, as contended by the petitioner. The *Handbook* notes that a wide range of educational backgrounds is suitable for entry into the aforementioned positions, but that many employers prefer related experience plus a broad liberal arts background. Bachelor's degrees in sociology, psychology, literature, journalism, philosophy, or other subjects are suitable. Requirements will vary, however, depending on the duties of a particular position. For example, some employers prefer a bachelor's or master's degree in business administration with an emphasis in marketing, for marketing, sales, and promotion management positions. In highly technical industries such as computer and electronics manufacturing a degree in engineering or science combined with a business degree may be preferred. In public relations management positions some employers prefer a bachelor's or master's degree in public relations or journalism. The *Handbook* further notes that most advertising, marketing, promotions, public relations, and sales management positions are filled by promoting experienced staff or related professional or technical personnel. Many managers are former sales representatives, purchasing agents, or promotions specialists. A baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is not, therefore, the minimum requirement for entry into the position. A degree in a wide range of disciplines will suffice. The petitioner has, accordingly, failed to establish the first criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The petitioner has also failed to establish that a degree requirement, in a specific specialty, is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). In support of this assertion the petitioner submitted copies of five job advertisements for business development/marketing/sales training type positions. Of those five advertisements, three required a bachelor's degree, but do not indicate that the degree need be in any particular discipline. The two that designated specific education requirements, required degrees in business, logistics, market research, operations research, business administration, and math/statistics. The advertisements submitted do not establish that a degree in a specific specialty is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. They in fact establish the contrary and confirm the findings of the *Handbook* with regard to the educational requirements of the offered position, that degrees in a wide range of educational disciplines will qualify an individual to perform the duties of the position. The petitioner has not established the referenced criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The petitioner asserts that it normally requires a degree or its equivalent for entry into the proffered position, but offers no evidence in support of that assertion. Simply going on the 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 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Further, CIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and

determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). The critical element is not the title of the position or an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.¹ To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if CIS were limited to reviewing a petitioner's self-imposed employment requirements, then any alien with a bachelor's degree could be brought into the United States to perform menial, non-professional, or an otherwise non-specialty occupation, so long as the employer required all such employees to have baccalaureate or higher degrees. *See id* at 388. The petitioner has, therefore, failed to establish the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

Finally, the duties to be performed by the beneficiary are not so specialized or complex that knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty. Nor are the duties so complex or unique that they can be performed only by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty. The duties appear to be routine for the position in the industry. The petitioner has, therefore, failed to establish the referenced criteria at 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) or (4).

The final issue to be considered is whether the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. It has been determined that the offered position does not qualify as a specialty occupation, thus, there would be no regulatory requirement that the petitioner possess any specific level of education in order to qualify to perform the duties of that position. Suffice it to say that the petitioner deems the beneficiary qualified to perform the duties of the position based upon her past education, training, and experience. That determination is one over which the petitioner has sole authority and discretion as the position does not qualify for H-1B status and is not subject to regulation by CIS.

The petitioner has failed to establish that the offered position meets any of the criteria listed at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). 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 failed to sustain that burden and the appeal shall accordingly be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.

¹ The court in *Defensor v. Meissner* observed that the four criteria at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) present certain ambiguities when compared to the statutory definition, and "might also be read as merely an additional requirement that a position must meet, in addition to the statutory and regulatory definition." *See id.* at 387.