

(b)(6)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

DATE: **AUG 25 2014** OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

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:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, 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.

On the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as an 82-employee information technology and supply chain management company established in 1996.¹ In order to employ the beneficiary in a full-time position to which it assigned the job title "Computer Systems Analyst," the petitioner seeks 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). In support of this petition, the petitioner submitted a Labor Condition Application (LCA) certified for use with a job offer falling within the "Computer Systems Analysts" occupational category, at a Level I (entry-level) prevailing wage rate.

The director denied the petition, concluding that the evidence of record does not demonstrate that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

The record of proceeding before this office contains the following: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the director's letter denying the petition; and (5) the Form I-290B, a brief, and supporting documentation.

We find that upon review of the entire record of proceeding, the evidence of record does not overcome the director's ground for denying this petition. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

Beyond the decision of the director, however, we first find an additional aspect which, although not addressed in the director's decision, nevertheless also precludes approval of the petition, namely, the petitioner's failure to establish that the position as described constitutes a specialty occupation.² U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) is required to follow long-standing legal standards and determine first, whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, and second, whether an alien beneficiary was qualified for the position at the time the nonimmigrant visa petition was filed. *Cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Assoc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 558, 560 (Comm'r 1988) ("The facts of a beneficiary's background only come at issue after it is found that the position in which the

¹ The petitioner provided a North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code of 541511, "Custom Computer Programming Services." U.S. Dep't of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, North American Industry Classification System, 2012 NAICS Definition, "541511 Custom Computer Programming Services," <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/sssd/naics/naicsrch> (last visited Aug. 20, 2014).

² An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by this office even if the service center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003). We conduct appellate review on a *de novo* basis (*See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004)), and it was in the course of this review that we identified this additional ground for denial.

petitioner intends to employ him falls within [a specialty occupation]."). Therefore, for this additional reason, the petition must be denied.

Accordingly, we will first address our finding that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. We will then address the director's finding that the evidence of record does not establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

I. The Petitioner and the Proffered Position

As noted above, the petitioner stated on the Form I-129 that it has been doing business as an information technology and supply chain management company since 1996, that it currently employs 82 individuals, and that it has a gross annual income of \$32,609,797. The petitioner's net annual income was left blank.

The petitioner's April 1, 2013 letter of support, which was filed with the Form I-129, described the petitioner as follows:

THE PETITIONER

[The petitioner] is an established leader in strategy and business process consulting, systems integration and outsourced business services in Supply Chain Management. The firm is rated by AMR research as one of the top SAP supply chain planning providers. Headquartered in [REDACTED] California, part of the region known as [REDACTED] of California, we have 110 employees around the [REDACTED] [The petitioner] is the division of the \$14.4 billion [REDACTED]—a respected multinational industrial conglomerate.

The letter further described the proffered position and its duties as follows:

JOB DUTIES FOR [THE BENEFICIARY]

[The beneficiary] will work for [the petitioner] as a Computer Systems Analyst, and will be involved in the analysis, modification, design, and continued development and implementation of software and system components from the inception of projects to completion for our client, [REDACTED] USA. He will work to meet clients' ongoing software needs through systems analysis, integration, upgrading, and ongoing support. He will utilize his skills and academic background to review, design, and create new software products to improve clients' existing system, and coordinate the implementation of new software to ensure compatibility and cohesive response in the overall network. [The beneficiary] will work to ensure that quality standards are maintained, and evaluate existing systems to improve production and workflow.

The Computer Systems Analyst will prepare and review diagrams, spreadsheets, and flowcharts to illustrate sequences and steps in the system, and to identify problems and propose solutions. He will coordinate with clients and users to evaluate requests for modifications for feasibility, and make recommendations based on users' needs. [The beneficiary] will also keep abreast of developments and innovations in the field of information technology through reading of technical manuals and reports, and provide assessment to clients of new technology and products.

Specifically, [the beneficiary] will also be responsible for:

Solution design and implementation (40%):

- Use of proprietary tools/template to capture business requirements and map businesses processes, identify gaps and design solution.
- Integrate with proprietary custom solutions and prepare functional specification on standard solution enhancement.
- Configure solution to map business processes.
- Assist in development of workflows, forms, data conversion, enhancements and reports.

Validating solution and fixing defects (20%):

- Prepare test strategy, plan and test scripts to validate functionalities provided in solution.
- Perform unit testing, integration testing and assist on user acceptance testing to validate solution.
- Recording, investigating and fixing defects.

Documentation & User training (20%):

- Document the configuration, processes on solution and development.
- Prepare user training documentation and train the users.
- Prepare solution support documents and provide training.

Hyper care and support solution (20%):

- Responsible for managing and supporting, during post go-live of solution and operational support using proprietary tool.
- Will also escalate issues within the defined escalation process for any urgent issues.
- As a SAP Supplier Relationship Management/procurement solution expert, will serve as an expert on the solution for fixing defects and assuring performance of solution.

The petitioner further states that "[t]he minimum requirements for this professional position are a Bachelor's degree in Computer Science, Engineering, and Technology or any related field and relevant work experience."

II. Specialty Occupation

Again, we will first address whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, we find that the evidence fails to establish that the position as described constitutes a specialty occupation. For this additional reason, the petition must be denied.

A. Law and Interpretations

To meet the petitioner's burden of proof with regard to the proffered position's classification as an H-1B specialty occupation, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the following statutory and regulatory requirements.

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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) states, in pertinent part, the following:

Specialty occupation means an occupation which [(1)] 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 [(2)] 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, a proposed position must also 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.

As a threshold issue, it is noted that 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must logically be read together with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). In other words, this regulatory language must be construed in harmony with the thrust of the related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *See K Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996). As such, the criteria stated in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) should logically be read as being necessary but not necessarily sufficient to meet the statutory and regulatory definition of specialty occupation. To otherwise interpret this section as stating the necessary *and* sufficient conditions for meeting the definition of specialty occupation would result in particular positions meeting a condition under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) but not the statutory or regulatory definition. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 387 (5th Cir. 2000). To avoid this result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as providing supplemental criteria that must be met in accordance with, and not as alternatives to, the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

As such and consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), USCIS consistently 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. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007) (describing "a degree requirement in a specific specialty" as "one that relates directly to the duties and responsibilities of a particular position"). Applying this standard, USCIS 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 occupations. These professions, for which petitioners have regularly been able to establish a minimum entry requirement in the United States of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position, fairly

represent the types of specialty occupations that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, USCIS does not simply rely on a position's title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations, are factors to be considered. USCIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally* *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384. The critical element is not the title of the position nor an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation, as required by the Act.

B. Preliminary Findings Regarding the Proffered Position's Duties and the Relative Complexity of the Position

Based on the evidence that is provided, we do not find that it establishes relative complexity, specialization and/or uniqueness as distinguishing aspects of either the proposed duties or the position that they are said to comprise. While the petitioner may claim that the nature of the proposed duties and the position that they are said to comprise elevate them above the range of usual Computer Systems Analyst positions and duties by virtue of their level of specialization, complexity, and/or uniqueness, the evidence of record does not support these claims. 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'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

As evident in the job description quoted above, the record of proceeding presents the duties comprising the proffered position in terms of relatively abstract and generalized functions. More specifically, they lack sufficient detail and concrete explanation to establish the substantive nature of the work and associated applications of specialized knowledge that their actual performance would require within the context of the petitioner's particular business operations. Take for example the following duty description:

Assist in development of workflows, forms, data conversion, enhancements and reports.

The evidence of record contains neither substantive explanation nor documentation showing the range and volume of workflows, forms, data conversion, enhancements and reports that the beneficiary would have to assist in developing. Likewise, the record does not clarify the substantive work and associated applications of specialized knowledge that would be involved in the referenced duty. Likewise, we see that the petitioner does not provide substantive information with regard to the particular work, methodologies, and applications of knowledge that would be required for the percentage-assigned duties, such as "Hyper care and support solution-20%." Thus, we conclude that, as generally described as all of the elements of the constituent duties are, they do not - even in the

aggregate - establish the nature of the position or the nature of the position's duties as more complex, specialized, and/or unique than those of other computer systems analyst positions.

C. Analysis

Having made the above preliminary findings, we turn now to the application of each supplemental, alternative criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to the evidence in this record of proceeding.

We will first discuss the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I), which is satisfied by establishing that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position that is the subject of the petition.

We recognize the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations it addresses.³ As noted above, the petitioner submitted an LCA in support of this position certified for a job offer as a computer systems analyst, within the "Computer Systems Analysts" occupational classification.

The *Handbook's* discussion of the duties and educational requirements of computer systems analysts states, in pertinent part, the following:

Computer systems analysts typically do the following:

- Consult with managers to determine the role of the IT system in an organization
- Research emerging technologies to decide if installing them can increase the organization's efficiency and effectiveness
- Prepare an analysis of costs and benefits so that management can decide if information systems and computing infrastructure upgrades are financially worthwhile
- Devise ways to add new functionality to existing computer systems
- Design and develop new systems by choosing and configuring hardware and software
- Oversee the installation and configuration of new systems to customize them for the organization

³ The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed online at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh>. The references to the *Handbook* are from the 2014-15 edition available online.

- Conduct testing to ensure that the systems work as expected
- Train the system's end users and write instruction manuals

Computer systems analysts use a variety of techniques to design computer systems such as data-modeling, which create rules for the computer to follow when presenting data, thereby allowing analysts to make faster decisions. Analysts conduct in-depth tests and analyze information and trends in the data to increase a system's performance and efficiency.

Analysts calculate requirements for how much memory and speed the computer system needs. They prepare flowcharts or other kinds of diagrams for programmers or engineers to use when building the system. Analysts also work with these people to solve problems that arise after the initial system is set up. Most analysts do some programming in the course of their work.

Most computer systems analysts specialize in certain types of computer systems that are specific to the organization they work with. For example, an analyst might work predominantly with financial computer systems or engineering systems.

Because systems analysts work closely with an organization's business leaders, they help the IT team understand how its computer systems can best serve the organization.

In some cases, analysts who supervise the initial installation or upgrade of IT systems from start to finish may be called IT project managers. They monitor a project's progress to ensure that deadlines, standards, and cost targets are met. IT project managers who plan and direct an organization's IT department or IT policies are included in the profile on computer and information systems managers.

Many computer systems analysts are general-purpose analysts who develop new systems or fine-tune existing ones; however, there are some specialized systems analysts. The following are examples of types of computer systems analysts:

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., "Computer Systems Analysts," <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-systems-analysts.htm#tab-2> (accessed Aug. 20, 2014).

The *Handbook* states the following with regard to the educational requirements necessary for entrance into this field:

A bachelor's degree in a computer or information science field is common, although not always a requirement. Some firms hire analysts with business or

liberal arts degrees who have skills in information technology or computer programming.

Most computer systems analysts have a bachelor's degree in a computer-related field. Because these analysts also are heavily involved in the business side of a company, it may be helpful to take business courses or major in management information systems.

* * *

Although many computer systems analysts have technical degrees, such a degree is not always a requirement. Many analysts have liberal arts degrees and have gained programming or technical expertise elsewhere.

Id. at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-systems-analysts.htm#tab-4> (accessed Aug. 20, 2014).

These statements from the *Handbook* do not indicate that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is normally required for entry into this occupational category. First, the *Handbook's* statement that "most" computer systems analysts have a bachelor's degree in a computer-related field is not the same as stating that such a degree is a minimum entry requirement. Second, even if most computer systems analyst positions required such a degree, the first definition of "most" in *Webster's New College Dictionary* 731 (Third Edition, Hough Mifflin Harcourt 2008) is "[g]reatest in number, quantity, size, or degree." As such, if merely 51% of systems analyst positions require at least a bachelor's degree or a closely related field, it could be said that "most" system analyst positions require such a degree. It cannot be found, therefore, that a particular degree requirement for "most" positions in a given occupation equates to a normal minimum entry requirement for that occupation, much less for the particular position proffered by the petitioner. Instead, a normal minimum entry requirement is one that denotes a standard entry requirement but recognizes that certain, limited exceptions to that standard may exist. To interpret this provision otherwise would run directly contrary to the plain language of the Act, which requires in part "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." § 214(i)(1) of the Act.

Additionally, with regard to positions that do require attainment of a bachelor's degree or equivalent, the *Handbook* does not indicate that a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty* or the equivalent is normally required. For instance, the *Handbook* states that technical degrees are not always required, and that many computer systems analysts have liberal arts degrees and gained their programming or technical expertise "elsewhere."

Furthermore, the materials from DOL's Occupational Information Network (O*NET OnLine) submitted by counsel do not establish that the proffered position satisfies the first criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) either. Unfortunately, O*NET OnLine is not particularly useful in determining whether a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is a

requirement for a given position, as O*NET OnLine's Job Zone designations make no mention of the specific field of study from which a degree must come. As was noted previously, we interpret 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 Specialized Vocational Preparation (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. Therefore, O*NET OnLine information is not probative of the proffered position being a specialty occupation.

Nor does the record of proceeding contain any persuasive documentary evidence from any other relevant authoritative source establishing that the proffered position's inclusion within the Computer Systems Analyst occupational group is sufficient in and of itself to establish the proffered position as, in the words of this criterion, a "particular position" for which "[a] baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry."

Finally, as noted previously, the petitioner submitted an LCA certified for a job prospect with a wage-level that is only appropriate for a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation (that is, Level I), which signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation.⁴

As the evidence in the record of proceeding does not establish that at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the

⁴ The *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* (available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf (last visited Aug. 20, 2014)) issued by DOL states the following with regard to Level I wage rates:

Level I (entry) wage rates are assigned to job offers for beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation. These employees perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. The tasks provide experience and familiarization with the employer's methods, practices, and programs. The employees may perform higher level work for training and developmental purposes. These employees work under close supervision and receive specific instructions on required tasks and results expected. Their work is closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy. Statements that the job offer is for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship are indicators that a Level I wage should be considered [emphasis in original].

The proposed duties' level of complexity, uniqueness, and specialization, as well as the level of independent judgment and occupational understanding required to perform them, are questionable, as the petitioner submitted an LCA certified for a Level I, entry-level position. The LCA's wage-level is appropriate for a proffered position that is actually a low-level, entry position relative to others within the same occupation. In accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels, by submitting an LCA with a Level I wage rate, the petitioner effectively attests that the beneficiary is only required to possess a basic understanding of the occupation; that she will be expected to perform routine tasks requiring limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that she will be closely supervised and her work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that she will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. See *id.*

particular position that is the subject of this petition, the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

Next, the petitioner has not satisfied the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). This prong alternatively calls for a petitioner to establish that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common (1) to the petitioner's industry; and (2) for positions within that industry that are both: (a) parallel to the proffered position, and (b) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

In determining whether there is such a common degree requirement, factors often considered by USCIS include: whether the *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)).

Here and as already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* reports a standard, industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Nor are there any submissions from a professional association in the petitioner's industry stating that individuals employed in positions parallel to the proffered position are routinely required to have a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into those positions. Nor has the petitioner submitted any letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attesting that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals.

Therefore, the petitioner has not satisfied the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), as the evidence of record does not establish that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common (1) to the petitioner's industry; and (2) for positions within that industry that are both: (a) parallel to the proffered position, and (b) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

Next, the evidence of record does not satisfy the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), which provides that "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."

In this particular case, the petitioner has failed to credibly demonstrate that the duties the beneficiary will perform on a day-to-day basis constitute a position so complex or unique that it can only be performed by a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent.

The record of proceeding does not contain sufficient evidence to establish relative complexity or uniqueness as aspects of the proffered position. Rather, the petitioner has not distinguished either the proposed duties, or the position that they comprise, from generic computer systems analyst work, which, the *Handbook* indicates, does not necessarily require a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent to perform. As such, there is insufficient

evidence to find that the position is so complex or unique as to require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge such that a person with a bachelor's in a specific specialty or its equivalent is required to perform that position.

The petitioner therefore failed to establish how the beneficiary's responsibilities and day-to-day duties comprise a position so complex or unique that the position can be performed only by an individual with a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

As the evidence of record therefore fails to establish that the beneficiary's responsibilities and day-to-day duties comprise a position so complex or unique that the position can be performed only by an individual with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent, the petitioner has not satisfied the second alternative prong at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) either.

We turn next to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3), which entails an employer demonstrating that it normally requires a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for the position.

To satisfy this criterion, the record must contain documentary evidence demonstrating that the petitioner has a history of requiring the degree or degree equivalency, in a specific specialty, in its prior recruiting and hiring for the position. Additionally, the record must establish that a petitioner's imposition of a degree requirement is not merely a matter of preference for high-caliber candidates but is necessitated by the performance requirements of the proffered position.⁵

Were USCIS limited solely to reviewing a petitioner's claimed self-imposed requirements, then any individual with a bachelor's degree could be brought to the United States to perform any occupation as long as the employer artificially created a token degree requirement, whereby all individuals employed in a particular position possessed a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty or its equivalent. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 387. In other words, if a petitioner's assertion of a particular degree requirement is not necessitated by the actual performance requirements of the proffered position, the position would not meet the statutory or regulatory definition of a specialty occupation. *See* § 214(i)(1) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "specialty occupation").

To satisfy this criterion, the evidence of record must therefore show that the specific performance requirements of the position generated the recruiting and hiring history. A petitioner's perfunctory declaration of a particular educational requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. USCIS must examine the actual employment requirements, and, on the basis of that examination, determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 387. In this pursuit, the critical element is not the title of the position, or the fact that an employer has routinely insisted on certain educational standards, but whether performance of the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of

⁵ Any such assertion would be undermined in this particular case by the fact that the petitioner indicated in the LCA that its proffered position is a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within the same occupation.

a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.

As the record of proceeding contains no evidence regarding the petitioner's recruiting and hiring of any other computer systems analysts, there is no evidence for consideration under this criterion. As the record of proceeding does not demonstrate that the petitioner normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for the proffered position, it does not satisfy 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

Next, the evidence of record does not satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4), which requires the petitioner to establish that the nature of the proffered position's duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty or its equivalent.

In reviewing the record of proceeding under this criterion, we reiterate our earlier discussion regarding the *Handbook's* entries for positions falling within the "Computer Systems Analysts" occupational category. Again, the *Handbook* does not indicate that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or the equivalent, is a standard, minimum requirement to perform the duties of such positions; and the record indicates no factors, such as supervisory responsibilities, that would elevate the duties proposed for the beneficiary above those discussed in the *Handbook* for entry-level positions. As reflected in this decision's earlier discussion, the proposed duties as described in the record of proceeding contain no indication of specialization and complexity such that the knowledge they would require is usually associated with any particular level of education in a specific specialty or its equivalent. As generically and generally as they were described, the duties of the proposed position are not presented with sufficient detail and explanation to establish the substantive nature of the duties as they would be performed in the specific context of the petitioner's particular business operations. Also as a result of the generalized and relatively abstract level at which the duties are described, the record of proceeding does not establish their nature as so specialized and complex relative to other positions within the same occupation as to require knowledge usually associated with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or the equivalent. We incorporate into the analysis of this criterion this decision's earlier comments and findings with regard to the generalized level at which the duties are described in the record. The evidence of record does not develop the duties in sufficient detail to establish their nature as so specialized and complex that their performance would require knowledge usually associated with the attainment of at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty. For all of these reasons, the evidence in the record of proceeding fails to establish that the proposed duties meet the relative specialization and complexity threshold at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

Additionally, we find that both on its own terms and also in comparison with the three higher wage-levels that can be designated in an LCA, by the submission of an LCA certified for a wage-level I, the petitioner effectively attests that the proposed duties are of relatively low complexity as compared to others within the same occupational category. This fact is materially inconsistent with the level of complexity required by this criterion.

As earlier noted, the *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* issued by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) states the following with regard to Level I wage rates:

Level I (entry) wage rates are assigned to job offers for beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation. These employees perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. The tasks provide experience and familiarization with the employer's methods, practices, and programs. The employees may perform higher level work for training and developmental purposes. These employees work under close supervision and receive specific instructions on required tasks and results expected. Their work is closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy. Statements that the job offer is for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship are indicators that a Level I wage should be considered [emphasis in original].

See DOL, Employment and Training Administration's *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagricultural Immigration Programs (Rev. Nov. 2009), available on the Internet at: http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf.

The pertinent guidance from the Department of Labor, at page 7 of its *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the next higher wage-level as follows:

Level II (qualified) wage rates are assigned to job offers for qualified employees who have attained, either through education or experience, a good understanding of the occupation. They perform moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment. An indicator that the job request warrants a wage determination at Level II would be a requirement for years of education and/or experience that are generally required as described in the O*NET Job Zones.

Id. The above descriptive summary indicates that even this higher-than-designated wage level is appropriate for only "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment." *Id.* The fact that this higher-than-here-assigned, Level II wage-rate itself indicates performance of only "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment," is very telling with regard to the relatively low level of complexity imputed to the proffered position by virtue of its Level I wage-rate designation.

Further, we note the relatively low level of complexity that even this Level II wage-level reflects when compared with the two still-higher LCA wage levels, neither of which was designated on the LCA submitted to support this petition.

The aforementioned *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the Level III wage designation as follows:

Level III (experienced) wage rates are assigned to job offers for experienced employees who have a sound understanding of the occupation and have attained, either through education or experience, special skills or knowledge. They perform tasks that require exercising judgment and may coordinate the activities of other staff. They may have supervisory authority over those staff. A requirement for years

of experience or educational degrees that are at the higher ranges indicated in the O*NET Job Zones would be indicators that a Level III wage should be considered.

Frequently, key words in the job title can be used as indicators that an employer's job offer is for an experienced worker. . . .

See DOL, Employment and Training Administration's *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagricultural Immigration Programs (Rev. Nov. 2009), available on the Internet at: http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf.

The *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the Level IV wage designation as follows:

Level IV (fully competent) wage rates are assigned to job offers for competent employees who have sufficient experience in the occupation to plan and conduct work requiring judgment and the independent evaluation, selection, modification, and application of standard procedures and techniques. Such employees use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems. These employees receive only technical guidance and their work is reviewed only for application of sound judgment and effectiveness in meeting the establishment's procedures and expectations. They generally have management and/or supervisory responsibilities.

Id. Here we again incorporate our earlier discussion and analysis regarding the implications of the petitioner's submission of an LCA certified for the lowest assignable wage-level. By virtue of this submission, the petitioner effectively attested that the proffered position is a low-level, entry position relative to others within the occupation, and that, as clear by comparison with DOL's instructive comments about the next higher level (Level II), the proffered position did not even involve "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment" (the level of complexity noted for the next higher wage-level, Level II). See *id.*

For all of these reasons, the evidence in the record of proceeding fails to establish that the proposed duties meet the specialization and complexity threshold at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

As the petitioner has not satisfied at least one of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it cannot be found that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. This aspect of the petition precludes its approval and makes the beneficiary's qualifications irrelevant. However, we will nonetheless also address the lack of sufficient evidence of record to establish the beneficiary is qualified to serve in a specialty occupation.

III. Beneficiary Qualifications

We will now address the director's determination that the evidence in the record has not established that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. Based on a complete review of the record of proceeding, we find that the evidence fails to establish that the

beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied for this additional reason.

The statutory and regulatory framework that we must apply in our consideration of the evidence of the beneficiary's qualification to serve in a specialty occupation follows below.

Section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(2), states that an alien applying for classification as an H-1B nonimmigrant worker must possess:

- (A) full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation,
- (B) completion of the degree described in paragraph (1)(B) for the occupation, or
- (C)
 - (i) experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree, and
 - (ii) recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

In implementing section 214(i)(2) of the Act, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C) states that an alien must also meet one of the following criteria in order to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation:

- (1) Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (2) Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (3) Hold an unrestricted state license, registration or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
- (4) Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation, and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

In addition, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(v)(A) states:

General. If an occupation requires a state or local license for an individual to fully perform the duties of the occupation, an alien (except an H-1C nurse) seeking H classification in that occupation must have that license prior to approval of the petition to be found qualified to enter the United States and immediately engage in employment in the occupation.

Therefore, to qualify an alien for classification as an H-1B nonimmigrant worker under the Act, the petitioner must establish that the beneficiary possesses the requisite license or, if none is required, that he or she has completed a degree in the specialty that the occupation requires. Alternatively, if a license is not required and if the beneficiary does not possess the required U.S. degree or its foreign degree equivalent, the petitioner must show that the beneficiary possesses both (1) education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree, and (2) recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

In order to equate a beneficiary's credentials to a U.S. baccalaureate or higher degree, the provisions at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D) require one or more of the following:

- (1) An evaluation from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience;
- (2) The results of recognized college-level equivalency examinations or special credit programs, such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSIS);
- (3) An evaluation of education by a reliable credentials evaluation service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials;⁶
- (4) Evidence of certification or registration from a nationally-recognized professional association or society for the specialty that is known to grant certification or registration to persons in the occupational specialty who have achieved a certain level of competence in the specialty;
- (5) A determination by the Service that the equivalent of the degree required by the specialty occupation has been acquired through a combination of education, specialized training, and/or work experience in areas related to the specialty and that the alien has achieved recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation as a result of such training and experience. . . .

⁶ The petitioner should note that, in accordance with this provision, we will accept a credentials evaluation service's evaluation of *education only*, not training and/or work experience.

In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5):

For purposes of determining equivalency to a baccalaureate degree in the specialty, three years of specialized training and/or work experience must be demonstrated for each year of college-level training the alien lacks. . . . It must be clearly demonstrated that the alien's training and/or work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty occupation; that the alien's experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation; and that the alien has recognition of expertise in the specialty evidenced by at least one type of documentation such as:

- (i) Recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation by at least two recognized authorities in the same specialty occupation;
- (ii) Membership in a recognized foreign or United States association or society in the specialty occupation;
- (iii) Published material by or about the alien in professional publications, trade journals, books, or major newspapers;
- (iv) Licensure or registration to practice the specialty occupation in a foreign country; or
- (v) Achievements which a recognized authority has determined to be significant contributions to the field of the specialty occupation.

It is always worth noting that, by its very terms, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5) is a matter strictly for USCIS application and determination, and that, also by the clear terms of the rule, experience will merit a positive determination only to the extent that the record of proceeding establishes all of the qualifying elements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5) – including, but not limited to, a type of professional recognition.

The record contains a March 19, 2013 evaluation of the beneficiary's academic credentials prepared by [REDACTED] Evaluator, [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] maintains that "[o]n the basis of the credibility of [REDACTED] the number of years of coursework, the nature of the coursework, the grades earned in the coursework, and the hours of academic coursework, it is the judgment of [REDACTED] that [the beneficiary] has attained the equivalent of a Bachelor of Science degree in Industrial Engineering, from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States."

In this matter, the petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a computer systems analyst. While a computer systems analyst does not, by virtue of its classification alone, qualify as a

specialty occupation, based on the information provided in the *Handbook*, a specialty occupation-level computer systems analyst would most commonly have a bachelor's or higher degree in a computer or information science field for entry into that position. See U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., "Computer Systems Analysts," <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-systems-analysts.htm#tab-4> (accessed Aug. 20, 2014). Therefore, the petitioner fails to demonstrate how the beneficiary, by virtue of holding the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree in industrial engineering, is qualified to perform the duties of a computer systems analyst.

In response to the director's RFE, counsel submitted a September 18, 2013 letter from [REDACTED] Ph.D., concluding that "based on the accepted equivalency ratio of 3 years of progressive experience being the equivalent of one year of academic coursework in conjunction with my subjective analysis of [the beneficiary's] five years of work history as evidenced by his resume and work letters, it is my expert opinion that [the beneficiary] has no less than the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree in Management Information Systems."

On appeal, counsel submitted a January 13, 2014 expert credential evaluation from [REDACTED] Ph.D. Dr. [REDACTED] found that based on the beneficiary's academic coursework and "considering more than nine years of progressively responsible work experience and professional training in Management Information Systems, and related area, it is my opinion that [the beneficiary] has attained the equivalent of a Bachelor of Science degree in Management Information Systems from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States."

To begin, we note that Dr. [REDACTED] and Dr. [REDACTED] have provided inconsistent information with respect to the beneficiary's qualifications. Dr. [REDACTED] references that the beneficiary has "five years of work history" while Dr. [REDACTED] references that the beneficiary has "nine years of progressively responsible work experience and professional training." It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

Furthermore, in order to evaluate a beneficiary's training and/or experience, an evaluation must be issued from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience. The documentation submitted with this petition is not sufficient to establish this criterion.

The letter from [REDACTED] Registrar, [REDACTED] states that Dr. [REDACTED] "has the authority to make determinations concerning the granting of college-level credit for training and experience in the concentrations of Computer Science and related fields that the University offers." The record fails, however, to evidence that Dr. [REDACTED] has the authority to "grant" college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has

Page 21

a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1).

Furthermore, the letter from [REDACTED] Ph.D., [REDACTED] states the following:

Professor [REDACTED] reviews credential of foreign and domestic students for educational transfer credit in the areas of Multimedia, Journalist, Graphic Design, Web and Computer Application Development, and related fields that the University offers. . . . Dr. [REDACTED] evaluates knowledge acquired from universities for matriculated students, as well as from professional experience. Further, Professor [REDACTED] is excellent in evaluating relevant domestic and international education and relevant work experience of students to determine their academic experience, and he is authorized to recommend the award of credits by [REDACTED]

Therefore, the record also fails to evidence that Dr. [REDACTED] has the authority to "grant" college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1).

Thus, the supporting documentation is not sufficient to establish that the evaluators, Dr. [REDACTED] or Dr. [REDACTED] currently have the authority to grant college-level credit for training or experience. 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'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm'r 1972)).

The petitioner has also failed to satisfy any of the criteria outlined in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1)-(4), thus, we will next perform a Service evaluation pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5). We reiterate that, by its very terms, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5) is a matter strictly for USCIS application and determination, and that, also by the clear terms of the regulation, experience will merit a positive determination only to the extent that the record of proceeding establishes all of the qualifying elements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5) – including, but not limited to, a type of professional recognition.

In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5):

For purposes of determining equivalency to a baccalaureate degree in the specialty, three years of specialized training and/or work experience must be demonstrated for each year of college-level training the alien lacks. . . . It must be clearly demonstrated that the alien's training and/or work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty occupation; that the alien's experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the

specialty occupation; and that the alien has recognition of expertise in the specialty evidenced by at least one type of documentation such as:

- (i) Recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation by at least two recognized authorities in the same specialty occupation⁷;
- (ii) Membership in a recognized foreign or United States association or society in the specialty occupation;
- (iii) Published material by or about the alien in professional publications, trade journals, books, or major newspapers;
- (iv) Licensure or registration to practice the specialty occupation in a foreign country; or
- (v) Achievements which a recognized authority has determined to be significant contributions to the field of the specialty occupation.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has not provided sufficient corroborating evidence as outlined in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5). The record contains copies of the beneficiary's academic transcript, his diploma from the University of Roorkee, his resume, and the above-referenced academic credentials evaluation and expert opinion letters.

Although the record contains some information regarding the beneficiary's work history, it does not establish that this work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the proffered position; that it was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who held a bachelor's degree in the specific specialty or its equivalent; and that the beneficiary achieved recognition of his expertise in the specialty as evidenced by at least one of the five types of documentation delineated in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5)(i)-(v).

Accordingly, the beneficiary does not qualify under any of the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5)(i)-(v) and, therefore, does not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4). As such, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the petition must also be denied on this basis.

IV. Conclusion and Order

⁷ *Recognized authority* means a person or organization with expertise in a particular field, special skills or knowledge in that field, and the expertise to render the type of opinion requested. A recognized authority's opinion must state: (1) the writer's qualifications as an expert; (2) the writer's experience giving such opinions, citing specific instances where past opinions have been accepted as authoritative and by whom; (3) how the conclusions were reached; and (4) the basis for the conclusions supported by copies or citations of any research material used. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

We agree with the director's findings that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. Beyond the decision of the director, we find that the petitioner has also failed to establish that it has satisfied any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) and, therefore, it cannot be found that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by this office even if the service center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

Moreover, when we deny a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge only if it shows that we abused our discretion with respect to all of our enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1043, *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683.

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

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