

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

81



FILE: WAC 07 148 52764 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 23 2008

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The director of the service center 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 information technology development and consulting business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst. The petitioner, therefore, 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 determining that the petitioner had not established that it qualifies as a U.S. employer or agent, or that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B, with counsel's brief and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before reaching its decision.

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)(ii):

Specialty occupation means an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in field 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 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 above criteria to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), *United States employer* means a person, firm, corporation, contractor, or other association, or organization in the United States which:

- (1) Engages a person to work within the United States;
- (2) Has an employer-employee relationship with respect to employees under this part, as indicated by the fact that it may hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of any such employee; and
- (3) Has an Internal Revenue Service Tax identification number.

In a March 26, 2007 letter submitted in support of the petition, the petitioner described the proposed duties of the proffered programmer analyst position as follows:

Research, design, develop, enhance, modify, and implement computer software applications. Analyze user requirements, procedures, and problems to automate or improve existing systems and review computer system capabilities, workflow, and scheduling limitations.

The record also includes a labor condition application (LCA) submitted at the time of filing listing the beneficiary's work location in Newark, California as a programmer analyst.

In an RFE, the director requested additional information from the petitioner, including an itinerary and copies of contracts between the petitioner and its clients for whom the beneficiary would be performing services, along with any statements of work/work orders, and/or service agreements for the beneficiary.

In response to the RFE, the petitioner stated, in part, that the petitioner is the actual employer and is not acting as an agent. The petitioner also stated that the beneficiary would be working on location for the petitioner's client, Siemens Medical Center, in the Newark, California area. The petitioner submitted supporting documentation, including the following: a list of the petitioner's current employees; a list of all the H-1B petitions filed by the

petitioner; the petitioner's job announcements; the petitioner's business license and brochure; a partial client list; a "contract staffing services agreement," made and entered into on December 20, 2002, between the petitioner and Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc.; a sample employee contract; the petitioner's income tax returns for 2005 and 2006; and copies of withdrawals for previous petitions.

The director denied the petition on the basis that, although the petitioner had submitted a work order between the petitioner and Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc., the petitioner had not provided valid contracts or an itinerary between the petitioner, the beneficiary, and the actual end-client where the proposed duties would be performed.

On appeal, counsel states that the petitioner is the sole employer that will hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the beneficiary's work, which is shown in the sample employment contract. Counsel also states that the petitioner's contract staffing agreement with the end-user client, Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc., also shows that the petitioner has ultimate control over its employees. According to counsel, the petitioner has satisfied all four criteria of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). To show that a baccalaureate degree is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the position, counsel cites the Department of Labor's (DOL) *O*Net* and the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)*, stating that the programmer analyst position normally requires a four-year bachelor's degree, and has an SVP rating of seven or eight, which represents education and/or experience that is equivalent to a bachelor's degree. To show that the degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, counsel cites AAO decisions, stating that the AAO has held that a programmer analyst and analyst/software engineer are professional positions requiring a degree. Counsel also lists job advertisements to show that similar positions require at least a bachelor's degree. To show that the petitioner normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the proffered position, counsel submits its own job advertisements. Finally, to show that the nature of the proposed duties is so complex that knowledge required to perform those duties is usually associated with a bachelor's degree, counsel states that proposed duties are consistent with both the DOL's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* and the *O*Net* descriptions as typical duties for computer programmers and programmer/analysts, positions that are sufficiently complex to require a minimum of a baccalaureate degree.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), *United States employer* means a person, firm, corporation, contractor, or other association, or organization in the United States which:

- (1) Engages a person to work within the United States;
- (2) Has an employer-employee relationship with respect to employees under this part, as indicated by the fact that it may hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of any such employee; and
- (3) Has an Internal Revenue Service Tax identification number.

Preliminarily, the AAO finds that the evidence of record is sufficient to establish that the petitioner will act as the beneficiary's employer in that it will hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the

beneficiary as set out in the petitioner's March 26, 2007 job offer letter to the beneficiary, the sample employee contract, and the client contract with Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc.¹ See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

The Aytes memorandum cited at footnote 1, indicates that the director has the discretion to request that the employer who will employ the beneficiary in multiple locations submit an itinerary. Upon review, the director properly exercised her discretion to request additional information regarding the beneficiary's ultimate employment, as the nature of the petitioner's business is locating and placing aliens with computer backgrounds into positions with firms that use computer programmers and/or analysts to complete their projects and the evidence contained in the record at the time the petition was filed did not establish that the petitioner had three years of work for the beneficiary to perform.² The AAO concludes that, although the petitioner will act as the beneficiary's employer, the evidence of record establishes that the petitioner is an employment contractor.

Pursuant to the language at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B), employers must submit an itinerary with the dates and locations of employment in such situations. While the Aytes memorandum cited at footnote 1 broadly interprets the term "itinerary," it provides CIS the discretion to require that the petitioner submit the dates and locations of the proposed employment.

The AAO acknowledges the petitioner's contract with Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc. This contract, however, does not include a comprehensive description of the beneficiary's proposed activities. Neither has the petitioner identified methodologies or applications of specialized knowledge that actual performance of the position's functions would involve or provided details of concrete matters upon which the beneficiary would work, nor explained or provided documentary evidence to establish how the beneficiary's actual substantive work would require at least a bachelor's degree level of knowledge in a specific specialty. Only a detailed job description from the entity that requires the alien's services will suffice to meet the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). The petitioner did not submit the requested evidence in the director's RFE pertaining to contracts, statements of work, work orders, and/or service agreements between the petitioner and its clients for whom the beneficiary would be performing services, along with any statements of work, work orders, or service agreements for the beneficiary. On appeal, counsel submits copies of previously submitted documentation, including the petitioner's contract with Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc. The record, however, does not contain any evidence, such as a work/purchase order, identifying the beneficiary as an assigned employee pursuant to the terms and

¹ See also Memorandum from Michael L. Aytes, Assistant Commissioner, INS Office of Adjudications, *Interpretation of the Term "Itinerary" Found in 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) as it Relates to the H-1B Nonimmigrant Classification*, HQ 70/6.2.8 (December 29, 1995).

² As noted by Assistant Commissioner Aytes in the cited 1995 memorandum, "[t]he purpose of this particular regulation is to [e]nsure that alien beneficiaries accorded H status have an actual job offer and are not coming to the United States for speculative employment."

conditions of that contract. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). As discussed above, the record does not contain a detailed description of the work to be performed by the beneficiary for Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc., the end user of the beneficiary's services. Absent such information, the petitioner has not established that it has three years' worth of H-1B level work for the beneficiary to perform. The petitioner has not complied with the requirements at 8 C.F.R. §214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) and the petition was properly denied.

In this matter, the petitioner does not provide substantive evidence that the duties of the proffered position incorporate the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge that requires the 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. Because the record does not contain a detailed description of the specific work to be performed by the beneficiary, the nature of the actual proposed duties is unclear and thus the AAO is precluded from determining whether the offered position is one that would normally impose the minimum of a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established the proffered position as a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(iii)(A)(I).³

In that the record does not provide a sufficient job description from the end user of the beneficiary's services, the petitioner is also precluded from meeting the requirements of the three remaining alternate criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Without a job description detailing the specific duties, the petitioner may not establish the position's duties as parallel to any degreed positions within similar organizations in its industry or distinguish the position as more complex or unique than similar, but non-degreed, employment, as required by alternate prongs of the second criterion. Absent a descriptive listing of the programmer analyst duties the beneficiary would perform under contract, the petitioner cannot establish that it previously employed degreed individuals to perform such duties, as required by the third criterion. Neither can the petitioner satisfy the requirements of the fourth criterion by distinguishing the proffered position based on the specialization and complexity of its duties.

The AAO also acknowledges counsel's assertion that the job description is consistent with the duties of a specialty occupation, as outlined in the DOL's *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)* and the *O*Net*. Counsel's reference to and assertions about the relevance of information from the *DOT* and the *O*Net*, however, are not persuasive. Neither the *DOT*'s SVP rating nor a Job Zone category indicates that a particular

³ The AAO observes that the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook* reports that there are many training paths available for programmers and that although bachelor's degrees are commonly required, certain jobs may require only a two-year degree or certificate; that most employers prefer to hire persons who have at least a bachelor's degree and broad knowledge of a variety of computer systems and technologies for positions of computer software engineer; and that there is no universally accepted way to prepare for a job as a systems analyst, although most employers place a premium on some formal college education. Thus, without a detailed job description regarding the work to be performed on a specific project, the AAO is unable to determine whether the project requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge.

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 and Job Zone category are meant to indicate only the total number of years of vocational preparation required for a particular position. Neither classification describes 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.

Counsel's additional assertion that the AAO has already determined that a programmer/analyst position qualifies as a specialty occupation is noted. This record of proceeding, however, does not contain all of the supporting evidence submitted to CIS in the prior cases. In the absence of all of the corroborating evidence contained in other records of proceeding, the information submitted by counsel is not sufficient to enable the AAO to determine whether the positions offered in the prior cases were similar to the position in the instant petition.

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, CIS 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 cases were similar to the proffered position or were approved in error, no such determination may be made without review of the original records in their entirety. If the prior petitions were approved based on evidence that was substantially similar to the evidence contained in this record of proceeding, however, the approval of the prior petitions would have been erroneous. CIS 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 CIS 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).

Upon review of the totality of the record, the record fails to reveal sufficient evidence that the offered position requires a bachelor's degree, or its equivalent, in a specific discipline. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

In view of the foregoing, the petitioner has not overcome the director's objections. For these reasons, the petition may not be approved. 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.