



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**



D2

FILE: WAC 02 273 53963 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAR 03 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 a dental clinic that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a dental 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. 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 dental consultant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's August 29, 2002 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to the petitioner's August 29, 2002

letter, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail: analyzing the clinic's operating procedures and devising efficient work methods; defining necessities such as the acquisition of new materials and dentistry equipment, the institution of new and/or alternative clinical procedures for patients, and the installation of new computer technology; consulting with the staff and making available to them the latest technological and surgical options; training the staff for emergency procedures, such as allergic reactions to medication; analyzing quality of x-rays; reviewing and discussing the documentation of dental charts; analyzing medically compromised patients with the doctors; and interpreting and supervising CAL-OSHA regulations. In a letter, dated June 16, 2003, the petitioner's president further describes the beneficiary's duties as follows: "[The beneficiary] will be required to confer with the entire staff on a regular basis and will most likely need to give individual attention and training to some, if not all, staff members. The types of employees that will be supervised, trained, and educated are dentists, dental assistants, and dental hygienists as well as office support staff." The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a doctor's degree in dental surgery or an equivalent thereof.

The director found that the proffered position is not a specialty occupation because the job is not a management analyst/consultant position; it is a dental assistant/office manager position. 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).

On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the proffered position is that of a management consultant specializing in dentistry. Counsel states further: "Someone who had never gone to dental school cannot tell practicing dentists what, if anything, they should be doing differently."

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 strategic management analyst, a position that is primarily found in management, scientific, and consulting firms, in computer systems design and related services firms, and in Federal, State, and local governments. The beneficiary's job duties do not entail the level of responsibility of a strategic management analyst. A review of the dental assistant and office manager job descriptions in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, confirms the accuracy of the director's assessment to the effect that, the job duties parallel those responsibilities of a dental assistant and

office manager. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a dental assistant and office manager job. Furthermore, upon review of the proposed duties that are described by the petitioner's president, it is not clear how the beneficiary could realistically supervise the work of licensed dentists. Not only is this duty unrealistic, but it also appears to be in violation of California's Business and Professions Code Sections 1625-1636.6, that was quoted by counsel in his October 9, 2003 letter, which indicates, in part, that a person who manages or conducts as manager in a place where dental operations are performed is practicing dentistry and, therefore, requires licensure. Accordingly, it is unclear how a dentist who is unlicensed in the United States would be supervising the work of U.S. licensed dentists. The record contains no explanation for this discrepancy. 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. 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, 591-92 (BIA 1988). It is also unclear how the beneficiary, a B-2 visitor for pleasure from Peru, possesses the expertise to "interpret and supervise CAL-OSHA regulations." 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 counsel does 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 appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.