U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY
identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy

[redacted]

FILE: WAC 02 276 51585 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 7 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 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.

Marie Johnson
for 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 importer and wholesale supplier of diamonds that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a part-time accountant. 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 proffered position is not a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

Section 214(i)(l) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(l), 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 part-time accountant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's August 15, 2002 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: performing accounting duties under the general supervision of the petitioner's senior accountant; reviewing expenditures and general ledger; monitoring operating budgets; and managing and supervising all accounting operations of assets administered. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in accounting.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the job is not primarily an accountant position; it is a bookkeeper 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 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 that the proffered position is that of an accountant, an occupation that requires a baccalaureate degree, as found by the DOL in various publications including the *Handbook* and the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles* (*DOT*). Counsel also states that the record contains letters from the petitioner's competitors and a newspaper advertisement as evidence that the degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. Counsel further states that the petitioner has never employed an in-house accountant before but has previously relied upon an outside accounting firm to handle all of the petitioner's accounting, auditing, and payroll requirements. Counsel states that the outside accounting firm's services will be cancelled upon appointment of an in-house accountant. Counsel finally states that the proposed duties, which entail primarily analysis, policy development, budgeting projections and controls, are the complex duties of an accountant, not a bookkeeper, who primarily records, updates, and maintains accounting and financial records.

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.Min. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Slattery*, 764 F. Supp. 872, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)).

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 an accountant. The proposed job duties do not primarily entail the level of responsibility of that occupation. A review of the Bookkeeping, Accounting, and Auditing Clerks job descriptions in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, confirms the accuracy of the director's assessment to the effect that, the job duties primarily parallel those responsibilities of a bookkeeper. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a bookkeeper job. Furthermore, in the petitioner's August 15, 2002 letter, the petitioner's president stated that the beneficiary would be working under the general supervision of the petitioner's senior accountant.

This information conflicts with the information submitted on appeal by counsel, who states that the petitioner has never employed an in-house accountant before, and the services of the petitioner's outside accounting firm will be cancelled upon appointment of an in-house accountant. The record contains no explanation for this inconsistency. 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).

Counsel's reference to and assertions about the relevance of information from the *DOT* are not persuasive. The *DOT's* SVP rating does not indicate that a particular occupation requires the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation. An SVP rating is meant to indicate only the total number of years of vocational preparation required for a particular position. The classification does not describe how those years are to be divided among training, formal education, and experience, nor specifies the particular type of degree, if any, that a position would require. Furthermore, the director did not state that the job of an accountant is not a specialty occupation. The director concluded correctly that the proffered position is not one of an accountant and, therefore, it does not require a baccalaureate degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty.

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

The record also contains letters from the presidents of two jewelry businesses and from the petitioner's outside accounting firm who assert that positions such as the proffered position require a baccalaureate degree in accounting. The writers, however, do not provide any evidence in support of their assertions. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence, however, is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

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 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. On appeal, counsel states that the petitioner has never employed an in-house accountant before. Therefore, the petitioner has not established the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*3*).

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(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.

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.