

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



D
I

FILE: WAC 04 057 50508 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **AUG 19 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 skilled nursing facility. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a maintenance engineer 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 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)(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 supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a maintenance engineer. 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. According to the evidence the beneficiary would:

- Manage all functions related to assuring an uninterrupted flow of steam, domestic hot and cold water, medical gasses, electricity, natural gas and other utilities to physical buildings;
- Assure comfort of patients, visitors and staff by operating and maintaining heating, ventilating and air conditioning equipment consisting of boilers and auxiliaries, chillers, pumps, cooling towers, air handling systems, controls and exhaust fans.
- Manage preventive and predictive maintenance systems on all equipment and systems essential for safe and efficient operation of the hospital's properties;
- Supervise, select, hire and train all technicians;
- Track the budget and approve expenditures;
- Be responsible for the processing of purchase orders and assure the prompt and accurate payment of invoices;
- Develop long range capital infrastructure needs for the development of the hospital budget; and
- Be responsible for the utilities management requirements of the JCAHO.

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. 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 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 with supervisory responsibilities as described in the *Handbook*. 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, and makes reference to the *Maintenance Engineering Handbook (MEH)*, 1995 edition, by L. Higgins, D. Brautigam, and K. Mobley. The advertisements listed are of little evidentiary value because the positions advertised are not similar to the proffered position, and are not from organizations similar in nature to that of the petitioner. Further, the *MEH* does not establish that the proffered position is that of an engineer, nor does it state that maintenance engineers require a baccalaureate level education in engineering or any other any other specific discipline. The documentation submitted states that the *MEH* provides information for plant engineers, maintenance engineers, facilities managers and managers. The resource is not intended to, nor does it purport to, offer evidence about the educational requirements of any given profession in the industry. 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 the 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 with supervisory responsibilities. 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 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 petitioner claims on the Form I-129 that it is a skilled nursing facility with 114 employees and gross income of \$6,169,382.73. No evidence of record supports these assertions. No evidence of the facility's size, construction or maintenance requirements is of record. The complexities of the duties have not been established to be those of a maintenance engineer as listed in the *Handbook*.

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.