

**PUBLIC COPY**

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

Security information is provided to  
prevent clearly defined  
invasion of personal privacy

*[Handwritten signature]*

**JAN 28 2005**

FILE: EAC 03 070 55682 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date:

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.

*[Handwritten signature of Robert P. Wiemann]*

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 an import/export distributor of promotional products and seeks to employ the beneficiary as an operations manager. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition because the position did not qualify as a specialty occupation, and because the beneficiary did not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief asserting that the proffered position is a specialty occupation and that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

The first 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 requests for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's requests; (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 an operations manager. 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: develop and formulate policies and strategic plans for the overall direction of the organization; coordinate the organization's business strategies; coordinate and develop operating budgets; monitor budgets monthly, as well as other financial statements; manage the sourcing of items for import; maintain and establish ties with suppliers in the United States and abroad; manage the sales staff; and organize trade shows. The petitioner requires a minimum of a bachelor's degree in business administration/international business 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. Min. 1999) (quoting *Hird/Baker Corp. v. Slattery*, 764 F. Supp. 872, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The duties of the proffered position are essentially those noted for general and operations managers who plan, direct, or coordinate the operations of companies or public and private sector organizations. These managers formulate policies, manage daily operations, and plan the use of materials and human resources. The petitioner has not met any of the above requirements to qualify the offered position as a specialty occupation. The proffered position requires general managerial skills, and those skills do not arise

from any particular specialty. Indeed, many management or top executive positions are filled by promoting experienced, lower level managers from within an organization. Other top executives/managers hold degrees in business administration or a liberal arts degree. A college degree in a specific specialty is not a minimum requirement for entry into the field of management. A degree in a wide range of disciplines will suffice for positions that do require a college education. The petitioner has, therefore, failed to establish the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

The petitioner asserts that a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, and in support of this assertion submits copies of several job advertisements. Those advertisements do not, however, establish that a degree requirement in a specific specialty is common in the industry. The advertisements indicate: (1) warehouse operations manager – requires a bachelor's degree or seven years related industry experience; the degree does not have to be in any specific specialty, and seven years of experience is not equivalent to a baccalaureate level education by regulatory definition (8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5)); (2) warehouse branch operations manager – states that a bachelor's degree or equivalent work experience is highly desirable, but not required, and does not state that a degree is preferred in any particular specialty; (3) plant manager/operations director – requires a four year degree in business or manufacturing; (4) plant operations manager – requires a bachelor's degree in engineering. The advertisements confirm the statements of the *Handbook* about the educational requirements of general or operations managers, that some positions are held by those without a baccalaureate level education, and that positions requiring degrees are generally filled by those holding degrees in a wide range of educational disciplines. The petitioner has failed to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The petitioner does not assert that it normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the proffered position as the position is new with the company. As such, the petitioner has not established the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 14.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

The petitioner has not established that the duties of the proffered position are so complex or unique that they can be performed only by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty, or that they are 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 those that would be routinely performed by general or operations managers in the petitioner's industry, and are routinely performed both by individuals with less than a baccalaureate level education, and those who hold degrees in a wide range of educational disciplines. The petitioner has not established the referenced criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) or (4).

The final issue to be considered is whether the petitioner is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position. It has been determined that the offered position does not qualify as a specialty occupation, thus, there would be no regulatory requirement that the petitioner possess any specific level of education in order to qualify to perform the duties of that position. Suffice it to say that the petitioner deems the beneficiary qualified to perform the duties of the position based upon his past education, training, and experience. That determination is one over which the petitioner has sole authority and discretion as the position does not qualify for H-1B status and is not subject to regulation by CIS.

The director also denied the petitioner's request for an extension of stay. That denial is not subject to appeal. The petitioner's only remedy with regard to this holding is to file with the director a motion to reopen and/or reconsider.

The petitioner has failed to establish that the offered position meets any of the criteria listed at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden and the appeal shall accordingly be dismissed.

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