

Unauthorized disclosure to
prevent identity information
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

[Handwritten signature]

[Redacted]

AN 31 2005

FILE: WAC 02 253 54060 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

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

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 dental clinic that seeks to employ the beneficiary as an orthodontic research assistant. 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 proffered position does not qualify as a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief and asserts 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 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 orthodontic research assistant. 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 evidence submitted in support of the Form I-129 petition, the beneficiary would: assist the dentist in a research project involving organizing, constructing, and repairing appliances for straightening teeth; remove separators and select fitting bands; prepare patients for direct bonding and performing emergency orthodontic adjustments; remove ligature wires and arch wires; take impressions for upper/lower arch diagnostic cast and fabricate the cast model; cure orthodontic materials, such as brackets in the operative site with light-curing equipment; give appropriate instructions to patients and/or parents in relation to the dental/orthodontic visit; perform emergency orthodontic adjustments; explain treatment plans and financial agreements to patients and responsible parties; and schedule appointments for orthodontic patients. The petitioner further detailed the beneficiary’s duties in response to the director’s request for evidence, all of which was reviewed by the AAO. The petitioner does not state that a degree in a specific specialty is required for entry into the proffered position, but states that the beneficiary is qualified for the position as a result of her Doctor of Dental Surgery degree.

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)).

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. 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 dental/orthodontic assistants. Although the petitioner states that the beneficiary will assist with a

research project, the record is void of any information detailing the complexity and method of research to be performed. As such, it cannot be determined that the research would be any different or more complex than typical research performed in dental offices by office staff on a regular basis. The *Handbook* notes that most dental assistants learn their skills on the job, though some are trained in dental assisting programs offered by community and junior colleges, trade schools, technical institutes, or the Armed Forces. It is, therefore, readily apparent that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is not normally the minimum requirement for entry into the offered position. The proffered position does not satisfy the first criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The petitioner does not assert that a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, or that it normally requires a degree in a specific specialty for entry into the proffered position, and offers no evidence in this regard. The petitioner has not, therefore, established the criteria at 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) or (3).

Finally, the duties of the proffered position appear to be routine for dental/orthodontic assistants. 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 establish 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 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.