

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



D2

FILE: EAC 06 192 52559 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **JAN 25 2009**



IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The director of the service center 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 software consulting business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a business analyst. The petitioner, therefore, 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 determining that the record failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

Section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(2), states that an alien applying for classification as an H-1B nonimmigrant worker must possess full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation, and completion of the degree in the specialty that the occupation requires. If the alien does not possess the required degree, the petitioner must demonstrate that the alien has experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree, and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, an alien must meet one of the following criteria:

- (1) Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (2) Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (3) Hold an unrestricted state license, registration or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
- (4) Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation, and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the 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 business analyst. The petitioner indicated that the beneficiary is a qualified candidate for the job because he possesses a foreign bachelor's degree in engineering, a U.S. master's degree in business administration, and related employment experience and training.

On August 22, 2006, the director sent an RFE to the petitioner, requesting an evaluation of the beneficiary's education, specialized training, and/or work experience from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience.

In a September 5, 2006 response, the petitioner's president stated that the beneficiary was qualified for the proffered position based on his U.S. master's degree in business administration, and resubmitted copies of the beneficiary's U.S. master's degree in business administration and transcripts.

On September 13, 2006, the director denied the petition finding that the beneficiary was not qualified for the proffered position because the petitioner had not submitted evidence that the beneficiary holds the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in computer science.

On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the beneficiary is qualified for the proffered position because he has a degree equivalency of a Bachelor of Science degree in computer information systems. Counsel submits an evaluation of the beneficiary's education, training, and employment experience as supporting evidence.

The regulation states that the petitioner shall submit additional evidence as the director, in his or her discretion, may deem necessary. The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8) and (12). The 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). Where, as here, a petitioner has been put on notice of a deficiency in the evidence and has been given an opportunity to respond to that deficiency, the AAO will not accept evidence offered for the first time on appeal. See *Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); see also *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). If the petitioner had wanted the submitted evidence to be considered, it should have submitted the documents in response to the director's request for evidence. *Id.* Under the circumstances, the AAO need not and does not consider the sufficiency of the evidence submitted on appeal. The appeal will be adjudicated based on the record of proceeding before the director.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform an occupation that requires a baccalaureate degree in a computer-related field. The beneficiary holds a foreign bachelor's degree in engineering, a U.S. master's degree in business administration, and three certificates of completion of computer training. The beneficiary, however, does not hold a baccalaureate degree from an accredited U.S. college or university in a computer-related field of study, or a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a baccalaureate degree from a U.S. college or university in a computer-related field of study.

Therefore, the petitioner must demonstrate that the beneficiary meets the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4).

When determining a beneficiary's qualifications under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4), the AAO relies upon the five criteria specified at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D). A beneficiary who does not have a degree in the specific specialty may still qualify for an H-1B nonimmigrant visa based on:

- (1) An evaluation from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience;
- (2) The results of recognized college-level equivalency examinations or special credit programs, such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI);
- (3) An evaluation of education by a reliable credentials evaluation service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials;
- (4) Evidence of certification or registration from a nationally-recognized professional association or society for the specialty that is known to grant certification or registration to persons in the occupational specialty who have achieved a certain level of competence in the specialty;
- (5) A determination by the Service that the equivalent of the degree required by the specialty occupation has been acquired through a combination of education, specialized training, and/or work experience in areas related to the specialty and that the alien has achieved recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation as a result of such training and experience.

As discussed above, the beneficiary holds a foreign bachelor's degree in engineering, a U.S. master's degree in business administration, and three certificates of completion of computer training. The record, however, does not contain an evaluation of the beneficiary's foreign education or other evidence demonstrating the beneficiary's qualifications as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C).

When CIS determines an alien's qualifications pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5), three years of specialized training and/or work experience must be demonstrated for each year of college-level training the alien lacks. It must be clearly demonstrated that the alien's training and/or work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty occupation; that the alien's experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation; and that the alien has recognition of expertise in the specialty evidenced by at least one type of documentation such as:

- (i) Recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation by at least two recognized authorities in the same specialty occupation¹;
- (ii) Membership in a recognized foreign or United States association or society in the specialty occupation;
- (iii) Published material by or about the alien in professional publications, trade journals, books, or major newspapers;
- (iv) Licensure or registration to practice the specialty occupation in a foreign country; or
- (v) Achievements which a recognized authority has determined to be significant contributions to the field of the specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submitted two employment letters from the beneficiary's foreign employer and from the petitioner, indicating that the beneficiary has computer-related work experience. The letter from the technical director of the beneficiary's foreign employer [REDACTED] located in Lucknow, India, indicates that the beneficiary worked as a systems analyst from June 2000 until January 2003. Information on the beneficiary's resume, however, indicates that from June 2000 through June 2001, he worked as an engineer trainee for [REDACTED] (pharmaceutical company), located in Bangalore, India, and that he worked as an assistant project manager from November 2001 through January 2003 for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] located in Lucknow, India. The record contains no explanation for these inconsistencies. 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). 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 (BIA 1988). The record also contains certificates of computer-related training. The record, however, contains insufficient evidence that this documentation is equivalent to a baccalaureate degree in a computer-related field.

Upon review, the record does not contain evidence that the beneficiary's prior work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty. The record does not contain evidence that the beneficiary's duties for his prior employer involve the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge relating to the occupation of programmer/business

¹ *Recognized authority* means a person or organization with expertise in a particular field, special skills or knowledge in that field, and the expertise to render the type of opinion requested. A recognized authority's opinion must state: (1) the writer's qualifications as an expert; (2) the writer's experience giving such opinions, citing specific instances where past opinions have been accepted as authoritative and by whom; (3) how the conclusions were reached; and (4) the basis for the conclusions supported by copies or citations of any research material used. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

analyst. Due to the inconsistencies discussed above, the foreign employment letter does not demonstrate that the beneficiary's past work experience included the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Further, the foreign employer does not indicate that the beneficiary's work experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation. The record also contains no evidence of the recognition of expertise required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5).

Likewise, the training certificates submitted are insufficient to establish that the beneficiary's computer-related training is comparable to academic courses taken at a four-year university that are a realistic prerequisite to attaining a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty in computer science or a related field. The record does not contain sufficient information regarding the computer training to evaluate the training as more than vocational coursework that results in technical skill.

In short, the record provides no basis for disturbing the director's decision. The petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in a specialty occupation according to the standards of 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C) and (D).

As related in the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has provided no contracts, work orders or statements of work describing the duties the beneficiary would perform for its clients and thus has also failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. The court in *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000) held that for the purpose of determining whether a proffered position is a specialty occupation, the petitioner acting as an employment contractor is merely a "token employer," while the entity for which the services are to be performed is the "more relevant employer." The *Defensor* court recognized that evidence of the client companies' job requirements is critical where the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner. The court held that the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service had reasonably interpreted the statute and regulations as requiring the petitioner to produce evidence that a proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation on the basis of the requirements imposed by the entities using the beneficiary's services. As the record does not contain any documentation that establishes the specific duties the beneficiary would perform under contract for the petitioner's clients, the AAO cannot analyze whether these duties would require at least a baccalaureate degree or the equivalent in a specific specialty, as required for classification as a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation under any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) or that the beneficiary would be coming temporarily to the United States to perform the duties of a specialty occupation pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(B)(1). For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See*

Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis).

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

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.