

identifying data deleted to
prevent disclosure of warranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



MAY 11 2005

FILE: WAC 04 041 52148 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 service company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a health service administrator. 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 beneficiary is not qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. On appeal, the petitioner submits a letter.

Prior to discussing the beneficiary's qualifications, the AAO must first address the question of whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

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 health service administrator. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's November 24, 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, implementing and maintaining policies and procedures related to health services; planning, directing, coordinating and supervising the delivery of health services to patients at clinics; supervising and working directly with financial officers and the company accountant and marketing director; preparing a health service management report; assisting the controller in preparing the company's annual budget; and evaluating and providing orientation to new employees. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in any medical, dental or healthcare-related field.

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.

The AAO routinely consults the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The duties of the proffered position are most like a health services manager. While the *Handbook* states that the general requirement for a health services manager is a master's degree, and a bachelor's degree is adequate for some entry-level positions in smaller organizations, it also states, "Physician's offices and some other facilities may substitute on-the-job experience for formal education." The petitioner provided no information about its client's business or worksite, so there is no evidence in the record to establish that it is a type of business that would require a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty rather than experience to fill the proffered position. Thus, the petitioner has failed to establish the first criterion.

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for health care administrators. There is no evidence, however, to show that the employers issuing those postings are similar to the petitioner's client, or that the advertised positions are parallel to the instant position. Thus, the advertisements have little relevance.

The record 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. The petitioner submitted the name of one its employees that it stated has worked as health service administrator and who has a degree in a medical, dental, or healthcare specialty. There is no evidence that he has ever worked for the petitioner, as he is not listed on the Forms DE-6 that the petitioner submitted. The petitioner also submitted its internal position announcement posted in its office. A flyer posted internally does not establish a history of hiring practices. In addition, the AAO notes that it is the client's past hiring practices that would be relevant to this issue. The record does not contain any evidence of the petitioner's client's past hiring practices. In *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th 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 an identical petition was previously approved, the record of proceeding does not contain a copy of the visa petition that the petitioner claims was approved. If the previous nonimmigrant petition were approved based on the same unsupported and contradictory assertions that are contained in the current record, the approval would constitute clear and gross error on the part of CIS. CIS is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. See, e.g. *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 597 (Comm. 1988). It would be absurd to suggest that CIS or any agency must treat acknowledged errors as binding precedent. *Sussex Engg. Ltd. v. Montgomery* 825 F.2d 1084, 1090 (6th Cir. 1987); *cert. denied* 485 U.S. 1008 (1988).

Furthermore, the AAO's authority over the service centers is comparable to the relationship between the court of appeals and the district court. Even if a service center director had approved the nonimmigrant petitions on behalf of the beneficiary, the AAO would not be bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. *Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS*, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D. La.), *aff'd* 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S.Ct. 51 (2001).

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 director also found that the beneficiary was not qualified to perform the services of a specialty occupation. The petitioner established that the beneficiary has the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in nursing from a United States university. The record does not reflect that the beneficiary is licensed as a nurse. The beneficiary could be qualified to perform the services of a specialty occupation that required a degree in nursing. Such qualifications would be conditioned upon the requirement of the state of intended employment as to whether the position also required licensure.

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.