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-01-071-52686 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JAN 16 2004

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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:

[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 a staffing solutions and business development consulting business with ten employees and a gross annual income of $1 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a medical and health service staff for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is 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 a baccalaureate degree is required for the proffered position, which is primarily that of a registered nurse and administrative assistant. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) previously has approved similar petitions.

Counsel's statement on appeal is not persuasive. The AAO does not use a title, by itself, when determining whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation. The specific duties of the offered position combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations are factors that the AAO considers.

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

> [R]esponsible with [sic] the administration of operations, directing and coordinating activities of medical, nursing, technical and clerical service and maintenance personnel of healthcare facilities. You will develop or expand medical programs or health services for research, rehabilitation, and community health promotions; implement and administers [sic] programs and services for health care or medical facility. Establish work schedules and assignments for staff, according to workload, space and equipment availability; prepares [sic] activity reports to inform management of the status and implementation plans of programs, services, and quality initiatives; consults with medical, business, and community groups to discuss service problems, coordinate activities and plans, and promote health programs.

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.

The petitioner has not met any of the above requirements to classify the offered position as a specialty occupation.

First, the AAO does not agree that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in nursing or a related

field. The proffered position is similar to that of a head nurse or nurse supervisor. In its *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (*Handbook*), 2002-2003 edition, at page 269, the Department of Labor (DOL) states the following about the training and educational requirements for registered nurse positions:

> There are three major educational paths to registered nursing: associate degree in nursing (A.D.N.), bachelor of science degree in nursing (B.S.N.), and diploma . . . . Generally, licensed graduates of any of the three program types qualify for entry-level positions as staff nurses.
>
> . . . .
>
> [S]ome career paths are open only to nurses with bachelor's or advanced degrees. A bachelor's degree is often necessary for administrative positions, and it is a prerequisite for admission to graduate nursing programs in research, consulting, teaching, or a clinical specialization.

The *Handbook* does not elaborate on administrative nursing positions within this classification, although reference is made to two nursing positions within the classification of registered nurse that appear analogous to the proffered position. The *Handbook* states the following about head nurses or nurse supervisors:

> Head nurses or nurse supervisors direct nursing activities. They plan work schedules and assign duties to nurses and aides, provide or arrange for training, and visit patients to observe nurses and to ensure the proper delivery of care. They also may see that records are maintained and equipment and supplies are ordered.

The proffered position appears to resemble a nursing position beyond the entry-level registered nurse, but it does not appear to be analogous to an administrative nursing position. A recent Immigration and Naturalization Service, now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS), policy memo provides the following commentary on administrative nursing positions: "Nursing Services Administrators are generally supervisory level nurses who hold an RN, and a graduate degree in nursing or health administration. (*See* Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Dep't of Labor,

Occupational Outlook Handbook at 75.)" [1] The *Handbook* reference is to the classification of medical and health services managers. On page 75, the *Handbook* states:

> The term "medical and health services manager" encompasses all individuals who plan, direct, coordinate and supervise the delivery of healthcare. Medical and health services managers include specialists and generalists. Specialists are in charge of specific clinical departments or services, while generalists manage or help to manage an entire facility or system.

In this case, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the proffered position is an administrative position, which would require a registered nurse with a master's degree in nursing or health administration. Rather, the proposed duties are similar to those of a head nurse or nurse supervisor, as described herein. As such, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the proffered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Second, counsel's assertion that Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) has already determined that the proffered position is a specialty occupation since CIS has approved other, similar petitions in the past is noted. This record of proceeding does not, however, contain all of the supporting evidence submitted to the California Service Center in the prior cases. In the absence of all of the corroborating evidence contained in those records of proceeding, the documents submitted by counsel are not sufficient to enable the AAO to determine whether the other H-1B petitions were approved in error.

Each nonimmigrant petition is a separate proceeding with a separate record. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(d). In making a determination of statutory eligibility, the AAO is limited to the information contained in the record of proceeding. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(ii). Although the AAO may attempt to hypothesize as to whether the prior approvals were granted in error, no such determination may be made without review of the original records in their entireties. If the prior petitions

[1] Memorandum from Johnny N. Williams, Executive Associate Commissioner, INS Office of Field Operations, *Guidance on Adjudication of H-1B Petitions Filed on Behalf of Nurses*, HQISD 70/6.2.8-P (November 27, 2002).

were approved based on evidence that was substantially similar to the evidence contained in this record of proceeding that is now before the AAO, however, the approval of the prior petitions would have been erroneous. The AAO is not required to approve 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). Neither the AAO nor any other 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).

Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is common to the industry in parallel positions among organizations similar to the petitioner. Finally, the petitioner did not demonstrate that the nature of the beneficiary's proposed duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

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.