PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536

[redacted]

File: WAC-01-233-52144 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JAN 14 2004

IN RE: Petitioner:
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:

[redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision 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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an escrow company with six employees and a gross annual income of $493,906. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a market research analyst for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

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), provides, in part, for nonimmigrant classification to qualified 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 a "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and 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 section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have 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.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner had not demonstrated that the beneficiary's degree in business administration qualifies her for a market research analyst position. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the beneficiary's educational background in business administration with a minor in managerial computing qualifies her for the proffered position.

In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

> [The beneficiary] will research market conditions in local, regional, or national area to determine

> potential sales of our service. She will be using improved marketing strategy to establish research methodology and designs [sic] format for data gathering, such as surveys, opinion polls, or questionnaires. [The beneficiary] will be using knowledge of market analysis and control to examine and analyzes [sic] statistical data to forecast future marketing trends. She will analyze our current client base structure and improve client interactions. She will facilitate internet communication among all partners (escrow, agents, broker, buyers, sellers, lender, and title company). She will design brochure [sic] and flyer [sic]. [The beneficiary] will collect data on clients' preferences. She will prepare reports and graphic illustrations of findings.

In the petitioner's October 24, 2001 letter that was submitted in response to the director's notice of intent to deny, the petitioner's president changes the title of the proffered position to that of an assistant market research analyst. The petitioner's president further asserts that the beneficiary qualifies for an assistant market research analyst position based on her educational background and employment experience with the petitioner.

The amended job title of assistant market research analyst is noted. As the record does not demonstrate that the petitioner has anyone working in the capacity of a market research analyst, however, it is not clear how it can realistically have an assistant market research analyst position.

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. It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, the 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.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D), equivalence to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree shall mean achievement of a level of knowledge, competence, and practice in the specialty occupation that has been determined to be equal to that of an individual who has a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty and shall be determined by one or more of the following:

(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 . . . .

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 occupation;

(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.

The beneficiary holds a Bachelor of Science degree in business administration with a minor in managerial computing, conferred by a U.S. institution. A review of the Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (*Handbook*), 2002-2003 edition, at page 240, finds that graduate education in economics, business administration, marketing, statistics, or some closely related discipline, is required for many private sector market research jobs. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not shown that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a specialty occupation based upon education alone.

The record indicates that the beneficiary had some practical training experience with the petitioner at the time of the filing of the petition. The petitioner's president asserts that the beneficiary's educational background coupled with her practical training experience qualifies her for the proffered position. The record, however, does not contain any independent, corroborating evidence that the beneficiary's educational background and employment experience are the equivalent of graduate education in economics, business administration, marketing, statistics, or some closely related discipline, as discussed by the DOL in its *Handbook*.

The beneficiary is not a member of any organizations whose usual prerequisite for entry is a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty. The record contains no evidence that the beneficiary holds a state license, registration, or certification that authorizes her to practice a specialty occupation. It is also noted that the record does not contain any documentation to establish that the beneficiary has achieved recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation, in accordance with 8 C.F.R.

§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5). In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in a specialty occupation.

Beyond the decision of the director, the record contains insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. As this matter will be dismissed on the grounds discussed, this issue need not be examined further.

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. Accordingly, the decision of the director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.