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

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[illegible] deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

D2

JAN 31 2005

[redacted]

FILE: SRC 03 227 57544 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

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.

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 in the hospitality industry and operates a motel. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an engineering consultant and endeavors to classify him 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 does not qualify as a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional information stating that the offered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

The issue to be discussed in this proceeding is whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), provides, in part, for the classification of qualified nonimmigrant aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation.

Section 214(i)(l) of 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.

The term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

> [A]n occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a 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 are 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) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's requests for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's requests; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B with supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as an engineering consultant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes the Form I-129 petition with attachment and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. The petitioner initially detailed the duties of the proffered position in its letter dated June 23, 2003. That duties listed therein were the duties of a mechanical engineer copied almost verbatim from the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT).* In response to the director's request for evidence, the petitioner clarified the duties of the position and indicated that the beneficiary would: oversee any future construction/renovation of hotel rooms; maintain fire prevention systems, security systems, refrigeration systems, heating and air conditioning systems, plumbing/drainage systems, back-up electrical generators, pool pump operation and filtration systems; washer and dryer appliances, and building repair materials. The petitioner requires a minimum of a bachelor's degree in engineering for entry into the proffered position.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the offered position, or that a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, as asserted by counsel. Factors often considered by CIS when determining these criteria include: whether the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (*Handbook*) reports that the industry requires a degree; whether an industry 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/Baker Corp. v. Slattery*, 764 F. Supp. 872, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The duties of the proffered position are not those of an engineer as stated by the petitioner, but essentially those of maintenance and repair workers as described in the *Handbook,* with some additional construction management responsibilities possible in the future. While the duties of the position may require a basic working knowledge of some engineering principles, they do not require the services of an engineer whose duties are sophisticated and complex, and may include the research, development, design,

manufacture and testing of tools, engines, machines and other mechanical devices in a number of industries and working environments. Maintenance and repair workers typically learn their skills informally on the job. They start as helpers, watching and learning from skilled maintenance or construction workers/foremen. Many also learn their skills in high school shop classes and postsecondary trade or vocational schools. It is clear that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty is not normally the minimum requirement for entry into the offered position. The petitioner has failed to establish the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*1*).

The petitioner states that a degree requirement in a specific specialty is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, and in support of that assertion submits copies of three job advertisements for engineering positions. Those advertisements are of little evidentiary value, however, because the positions advertised are not similar to the proffered position, and are not from organizations similar in nature to that of the petitioner. The evidence submitted in this regard does not satisfy the referenced criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*2*).

The petitioner does not state that it normally requires a degree in a specific specialty for offered position, and offers no evidence in this regard. Accordingly, the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) has not been established.

Finally, the duties of the proffered position appear to be routine for maintenance and repair workers. They are not so complex or unique that they can be performed only by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty. Nor are they so specialized or complex that knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty. The duties are routinely performed in the industry by individuals with less than a baccalaureate level education. The petitioner has failed to established the referenced criteria at 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*2*) or (*4*).

The petitioner also makes reference to the SVP rating assigned to engineering positions by the *DOT*. That rating, however, is not applicable to the offered position as the position is not that of an engineer. Furthermore, an SVP rating is meant to indicate only the total number of years of vocational preparation required for a particular position. The SVP classification does not describe how those years are to be divided among training, formal education, and experience, nor does it specify the particular type of degree, if any, that a position would require. An SVP rating does not establish that any particular position is, or is not, a specialty occupation.

The petitioner has failed to establish that the offered position meets any of the criteria listed at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). 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 and the appeal shall accordingly be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.