

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

D2



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 17 2005

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
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 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 a staffing company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a social service director. 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 petitioner did not establish that the proffered position was a specialty occupation or that there is an employer-employee relationship. On appeal, the petitioner submits a statement.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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.

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 notice of intent to deny; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's notice and supporting documentation; (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 social services director. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's May 10, 2001 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner's response to the director's notice of intent to deny. According to the petition and the letter of support, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail: providing staff orientation and evaluation of new employees; coordinating with staff in obtaining social service information to support patient's orientation, care plans, treatment and discharge; evaluating and providing solutions to environmental difficulties that may interfere with obtaining maximum benefits from medical care; conducting interdisciplinary care plan conference; ensuring implementation of policy and procedure; and preparing quarterly summary report for administration. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in psychology or social work. In response to the director's notice of intent to deny, the duties were described as: working in close collaboration with physicians and other health care personnel in patient evaluation and treatment to further their understanding of significant social and emotional factors underlying patient's problems; assisting patients and their families with personal and environmental difficulties which predispose illness or interfere with obtaining benefits from medical care. Participating in planning for improving health services by considering social factors (such as patient's age, family structure, work history, home environment) in prescribing treatment plans, including acute care hospitalization, long-term rehabilitation center, elderly home placement or home care placement; and coordinating staff and home health care providers in obtaining social service information required for prescribing care plans, treatment and discharge.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation.

On appeal, the petitioner states that it is the actual employer as the agent for the beneficiary. The petitioner also states that its client explained the conflicting statements made regarding who is to be the actual employer. The petitioner asserts that the job duties submitted in the petition are the duties required by the client. Finally, the petitioner states that workers are assigned and re-assigned to different locations as the need arises and, therefore, there are frequently multiple dated contracts.

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 Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (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.Minn. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The duties of the proffered position are not like any of the positions described in the *Handbook*. In response to the director's notice of intent to deny, counsel stated that the position description submitted at that time is like a clinical social worker/health services social worker as described in the Department of Labor's *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)*, and has an SVP rating of 7, which indicates that a bachelor's degree is required.

The *DOT* is not a persuasive source of information regarding whether a particular job requires the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, 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. It does not describe how those years are to be divided among training, formal education, and experience, and it does not specify the particular type of degree, if any, that a position would require.

In addition, a petitioner cannot establish its employment as a specialty occupation by describing the duties of that employment in the same general terms as those used by the *Handbook* or any other source, such as the *DOT*, in discussing an occupational title. This type of generalized description is necessary when defining the range of duties that may be performed within an occupation, but cannot be relied upon by a petitioner when discussing the duties attached to specific employment. In establishing a position as a specialty occupation, a petitioner must describe the specific duties and responsibilities to be performed by a beneficiary in relation to its particular business interests.

In the instant case, the petitioner has offered no description of the duties of its proffered position beyond the generalized outline it provided at the time of filing and in response to the director's notice of intent to deny. The petitioner has not established it will employ the beneficiary as a social service director; it cannot, therefore, establish that the position meets any of the requirements for a specialty occupation set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Although the record contains a staffing agreement between the petitioner and its client, the site where the beneficiary will work, the record does not contain a comprehensive description of the beneficiary's proposed duties from an authorized representative of the client. The description is identical to the general one provided in the letter of support; therefore, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the work that the beneficiary will perform for the client is a social service director or that it will qualify as a specialty occupation. Thus, the petitioner has not established the first criterion.

The beneficiary would not be working directly for the petitioner, but for the petitioner's client. The petitioner provided no information about that client beyond the staffing agreement, which gives the client's name, and a letter from the client addressing certain issues, but no information about its business. Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner provided no information about other similarly situated businesses.

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)(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. It is the petitioner's client's hiring practices, rather than the petitioner's, that must be considered. There is no evidence in the record regarding the petitioner's client's past hiring practices. In *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000), the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now CIS, reasonably interpreted the statute and the regulations when it required the petitioner to show that the entities ultimately employing the foreign nurses require a bachelor's degree for all employees in that position. The court found that the degree requirement should not originate with the employment agency that brought the nurses to the United States for employment with the agency's clients.

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(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 director also found that there was no employer-employee relationship established. The petitioner's client specifically stated to CIS that it paid the petitioner to file the petition, and that once an individual was hired, it would be the actual employer, paying and controlling the employee. In response to the notice of intent to deny, the petitioner provided a letter from the client stating that there was a misunderstanding, and that it pays the petitioner a "sign-in bonus" for locating workers, but that the petitioner pays the workers and has full authority over them. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is incumbent upon 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). The client's letter does not explain the "misunderstanding" or why he would have made statements to the director's representative that directly contradict the information in his letter. This information indicates that the petitioner is not the employer of the beneficiary.

If CIS fails to believe that a fact stated in the petition is true, CIS may reject that fact. Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b); see also *Anetekhai v. I.N.S.*, 876 F.2d 1218, 1220 (5th Cir.1989); *Lu-Ann Bakery Shop, Inc. v. Nelson*, 705 F. Supp. 7, 10 (D.D.C.1988); *Systronics Corp. v. INS*, 153 F. Supp. 2d 7, 15 (D.D.C. 2001).

An H-1B alien is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(ii)(B). In this case, the petitioner did not establish that the beneficiary would be coming to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation.

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.