

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

DZ

FILE: WAC 04 038 51846 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: NOV 02 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 board and care facility for the physically and developmentally challenged that seeks to extend its authorization to employ the beneficiary as a full-time accountant. 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 names, education, and immigration status of the employees holding the positions of accounting clerks and bookkeeper.

The petitioner was put on notice of required evidence and given a reasonable opportunity to provide it for the record before the visa petition was adjudicated. Although counsel claims that the names, education, and immigration status of the employees holding the accounting clerks and bookkeeper positions were submitted previously, a review of the record does not corroborate her claim. In her April 28, 2004 letter, counsel states, in part: "The chart shows the organizational and functional levels, specifically the Accounting Department which is the only relevant issue in this application." The only names that were on the organizational chart submitted in response to the director's request for evidence were the president's, the vice president's, and the beneficiary's. A review of the record finds that the "Finance and Accounting" document that counsel submits on appeal was not submitted previously. As such, the petitioner failed to submit the requested evidence and now submits it on appeal. However, the AAO will not consider this evidence for any purpose. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). The appeal will be adjudicated based on the record of proceeding before the director.

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 full-time accountant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; counsel's November 21, 2003 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. In her November 21, 2003 letter, counsel states, in part, as follows:

Petitioner is expanding its operations and is preparing to open 2 other facilities including the construction of its own office building. The expansion project is scheduled to start by Spring 2001 [sic]. This project represents a significant investment of the services of an experienced accountant to manage project revenues and expenditures, analyze and audit financial information and business transactions, prepare financial report to management and advise them on such matters as effective use of resources, and assumptions underlying budget forecasts.

Although not explicitly stated, it appears that the petitioner requires a baccalaureate degree in business administration with a major in accounting, or an equivalent thereof, for the proffered position.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the job is not an accountant position; it is a bookkeeping or accounting clerk position. Citing to the Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, 2002-2003 edition, 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 also found that the petitioner had not submitted all of the requested evidence, such as the names of its employees working in bookkeeper and accounting clerk positions. 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 an accountant, and is not an accounting clerk position. Counsel states further that CIS previously approved the beneficiary for the same position. Counsel also states that the petitioner's size bears no relationship to the need for an in-house accountant.

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 full-time accountant. The *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, reveals that specific job duties vary widely among the four major fields of accounting: public, management, government, and internal. The closest category to the proffered position is the management accountant. In the *Handbook*, management accountants — also called cost, managerial, industrial, corporate, or private accountants — record and analyze the financial information of the companies for which they work. Other responsibilities include budgeting, performance evaluation, and cost and asset management. Usually, management accountants are part of executive teams involved in strategic planning or new-product development. They analyze and interpret the financial information that corporate executives need to make sound business decisions. They also prepare financial reports for nonmanagement groups, including stockholders, creditors, regulatory agencies, and tax authorities. Within accounting departments, they may work in various areas, including financial analysis, planning and budgeting, and cost accounting.

In this case, information on the petition reflects that the petitioner is a board and care facility for the physically and developmentally disabled with 16 employees and a gross annual income of \$600,000. Counsel's statement on appeal that the petitioner operates four facilities and is opening two more in the next few months is noted. The petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978). Furthermore, although counsel also states that the size of the petitioning entity is not relevant in determining whether a position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the level of income generated by the petitioner has a direct and substantial bearing on the scope and depth of the beneficiary's proposed duties. Responsibility for the financial transactions described above differs vastly from responsibility associated with a far larger income or from a firm that is responsible for the accounting work of many clients. Consequently, the petitioner fails to establish that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position.

The duties described in the *Handbook* do not primarily apply to the proffered position. According to the *Handbook*, accountants prepare financial reports for nonmanagement groups, including stockholders, creditors, regulatory agencies, and tax authorities, and usually, they are part of executive teams. The beneficiary will not be part of an executive team. Nor will the beneficiary prepare financial reports for nonmanagement groups such as stockholders, creditors, regulatory agencies, and tax authorities. Given this significant dissimilarity, the scope and complexity of the beneficiary's duties and responsibilities do not rise to the level of an accountant. Consequently, a bachelor's degree in accounting or a related field — which the DOL states is required for a management accountant — would not be required for the proffered position. A review of the *Handbook* finds that the proposed duties are primarily the duties bookkeeping, accounting, auditing and financial clerks. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for these positions.

As discussed above, the petitioner also did not submit all of the evidence pertaining to the petitioner's organizational chart that was requested by the director on February 6, 2004. Failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).¹

Counsel also noted that CIS approved another petition that had been previously filed on behalf of the beneficiary. The director's decision indicates that he did not review the prior approval of the other nonimmigrant petition because the record did not contain a copy of the prior petition and its supporting documentation. If the previous nonimmigrant petition was approved based on the same unsupported and contradictory assertions that are contained in the current record, however, the approval would constitute material and gross error on the part of the director. The AAO 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 a court of appeals and a district court. Even if a service center director had approved the nonimmigrant petition 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).

The prior approvals do not preclude CIS from denying an extension of the original visa based on reassessment of petitioner's qualifications. *Texas A&M Univ. v. Upchurch*, 99 Fed. Appx. 556, 2004 WL 1240482 (5th Cir. 2004).

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. Other than documentation related to the beneficiary, the record does not contain any evidence of the petitioner's past hiring practices and, therefore, the petitioner has not met its burden of proof in this regard. Going on 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 Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

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.

¹ CIS records reflect that the petitioner obtained approval for an H-1B accountant position valid from January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2006. The petitioner failed to disclose this fact in its response to the director's RFE or on appeal, although specifically requested.

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.

Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO does not find that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation because the credentials evaluation submitted by the petitioner indicates that the beneficiary's foreign bachelor's degree is equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree in business administration. The field of business administration, however, is not a specialized field of study. *See Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm. 1988). For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

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.