

**Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

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




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**




*DL*

FILE: SRC 03 175 51364 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: **MAR 07 2005**

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.

*Michael T. Kelly*  
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 a dental laboratory and seeks to employ the beneficiary as a dental technologist. 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 does not qualify as a specialty occupation. On appeal the petitioner submits a brief indicating 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)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), 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 request for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B with counsel's brief. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a dental technologist. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes the I-129 petition with attachment and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to this evidence the beneficiary would: assist senior personnel in research and analysis of core business products; design and develop functional esthetics dental prosthetics; assign duties and oversee the performance of tests to ensure quality control on bite blocks, wax-ups, articulations, dental appliances, and other similar functions such as model evaluations; coordinate various research projects for determination and utilization of the most advanced technologies; review medical journals and their reported developments of particular relevance for new modes of construction, evaluations and processing times; work with dentists and material suppliers to design individual prosthetics; and coordinate research projects. The petitioner requires a minimum of a bachelor's degree in dental technology for entry into the proffered position.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. The AAO routinely consults the U.S. Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* for information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The duties of the proffered position are essentially those noted for dental laboratory technicians, not clinical laboratory technologists as suggested by the petitioner. The *Handbook* notes that most dental laboratory technicians learn their craft on the job. Becoming a fully trained technician requires an average of three – four years, depending upon an individual's aptitude and ambition. Training in dental laboratory technology also is available through community and junior colleges, vocational – technical institutes, and the U.S. Armed Forces. Accredited programs for dental laboratory technology normally take two years to complete and lead to an associate degree. A few programs take approximately four years to complete and offer a bachelor's degree in the field. The record is clear, however, that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, is not normally the minimum requirement for entry into the proffered position. Thus, the petitioner has not established the first criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The petitioner has also failed to establish that a degree in a specific specialty is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, and offers no evidence in this regard. The petitioner has failed to establish the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The petitioner does state that it normally requires a degree in a specific specialty for the offered position, but provides no evidence in support of this assertion. Simply going on the record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *See Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). The petitioner has, therefore, failed to establish the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

Finally, the nature of the specific duties is not 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. Nor are the duties so complex or unique that they can be performed only by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty. The duties of the position appear to be routine for dental technicians in the industry. The petitioner has, accordingly, failed to establish the referenced criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) or (4).

The petitioner also asserts that previous agency decisions have classified the offered position as a specialty occupation. This reference will not sustain the petitioner's burden of establishing H-1B qualification in the petition now before the AAO. This record of proceeding does not contain the entire record of proceedings in the petitions referred to by counsel. Accordingly, no comparison of the positions can be made. 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). It warrants noting that Congress intended this visa classification for aliens that are to be employed in an occupation that requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Congress specifically stated that such an occupation would require, as a *minimum* qualification, a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty. CIS regularly approves H-1B petitions for qualified aliens who are to be employed as engineers, computer scientists, certified public accountants, college professors, and other such professions. These occupations all require a baccalaureate degree in the specialty occupation as a minimum for entry into the occupation and fairly represent the types of professions that Congress contemplated when it created that visa category. In the present matter, the petitioner has offered the beneficiary a position as a dental technologist. For the reasons discussed above, the proffered position does not require attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation, and approval of a petition for another beneficiary based on identical facts would constitute material error, gross error, and a violation of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2 paragraph (h).

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.