

identifying data deleted to  
protect security unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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

PUBLIC COPY

D2



Date: DEC 01 2011 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE:

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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The director of the California Service Center denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner claims to be a company that specializes in manufacturing and marketing textiles related to chemicals with seven employees and a stated gross annual income of \$4 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an accountant 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 concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

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

The primary issue before the AAO is whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, 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 Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

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 [(2)] 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 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 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). To avoid this illogical and absurd result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as stating additional requirements that a position must meet, supplementing the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

Consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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. 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, fairly represent the types of specialty occupations that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

To make its determination whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the AAO first turns to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2): a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position; and a degree requirement in a specific specialty is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or a particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty. Factors considered by the AAO when determining these criteria include: whether the

U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL's) *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (hereinafter the *Handbook*), on which the AAO routinely relies for the educational requirements of particular occupations, reports the industry requires a degree in a specific specialty; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree in a specific specialty 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)).

In this matter, the petitioner seeks the beneficiary's services as an accountant. In the petitioner's support letter dated July 14, 2009, the petitioner states that the beneficiary's duties will include:

- Preparation and analysis of financial statements, accounts payable, and accounts receivable;
- Tax assistance;
- Analysis of financial data and business operations for the purpose of making recommendations and devising more cost-efficient methods;
- Preparing business plans relating to any proposed ventures, and providing advice to the petitioner regarding the financial viability of any such plans.

The AAO's first point with regard to its analysis of the proffered position is that, despite the petitioner's assumption to the contrary, accountants do not comprise an occupational group that categorically requires at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty for entry into the occupation in the United States.

The AAO recognizes the *Handbook* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses. As will now be discussed, the *Handbook* indicates that accountants do not constitute an occupational group that categorically requires a specialty-occupation level of education, that is, at least a U.S. bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2010-11 ed., available at <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos001.htm> (last accessed November 10, 2011).

The "Accountants and Auditors" chapter in the 2010-2011 edition of the *Handbook* indicates that not every accountant position requires at least a bachelor's degree level of knowledge in accounting or a closely related specialty. *Id.* More specifically, the introduction to the "Training, Other Qualifications, and Advancement" section of the *Handbook* states that "[m]ost accountants and auditors need at least a bachelor's degree in business, accounting, or a related field." *Id.* This does not support the view that any accountant job qualifies as a specialty occupation. "Most" is not indicative that a particular position within the wide spectrum of accountant jobs normally requires at least a bachelor's degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty (the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1)), or that a particular accountant position is so specialized and complex as to require knowledge usually associated with attainment of a

baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty (the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4)).<sup>1</sup>

Further, the "Education and training" subsection of the aforementioned section of the *Handbook* includes this statement:

Some graduates of junior colleges or business or correspondence schools, as well as bookkeeping and accounting clerks who meet the education and experience requirements set by their employers, can obtain junior accounting positions and advance to accountant positions by demonstrating their accounting skills on the job.

*Id.* In this context, the fact that a person may be employed in a position designated as that of an accountant and may apply accounting principles in the course of his or her job is not in itself sufficient to establish the position as one that qualifies as a specialty occupation. Thus, it is incumbent on the petitioner to provide sufficient evidence to establish that the particular position that it proffers here would necessitate accounting services at a level requiring the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's degree level of knowledge in accounting. This, the petitioner has failed to do.

In its support letter, the petitioner also states that it requires, at a minimum, a bachelor's degree in accounting. The petitioner submitted copies of the beneficiary's foreign degrees along with a credential evaluation finding that the beneficiary's foreign education is equivalent to a U.S. Bachelor's degree in Accounting and a U.S. Master of Business Administration degree with a specialization in Management.

On October 13, 2009, the director requested additional information from the petitioner to demonstrate that the proffered position is a specialty occupation, including evidence that a bona fide job offer for an accountant position exists.

On November 23, 2009, in response to the director's RFE, the petitioner submitted, in part, (1) information regarding the nature of the position and its business; (2) job vacancy announcements; (3) a line-and-block organizational chart; (4) a description of its accounting system; (5) and letters from companies in the industry.

The petitioner also included the following description of the proffered position's duties:

- Will set the timetable, specify the information needs, determine resource requirements,

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the first definition of "most" in *Webster's New Collegiate College Dictionary* 731 (Third Edition, Hough Mifflin Harcourt 2008) is "[g]reatest in number, quantity, size, or degree." As such, if merely 51% of accountant positions require at least a bachelor's degree in accounting or a closely related field, it could be said that "most" accountant 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.

and assign tasks and deadlines;

- Responsible for protecting assets, control systems, and complying with regulations;
- Keep track of money spent, compare actual costs to budget, and estimate future costs and margins;
- Under general supervision, the accountant is responsible for payroll functions, fixed assets, revenue functions, and other program areas;
- Assists in compliance with annual audit and single audit requirements;
- Provides technical supervision to payroll preparation and reporting with regard to federal and state payroll reporting requirements and labor regulations;
- Coordinates and supervises payroll benefit accounting;
- Maintains and evaluates the internal control systems within the financial system software including the Chart of Accounts and user security levels;
- Manages and coordinates financial system updates, conversions, and other software related requirements in the development of the petitioner's financial system;
- Coordinates installation and maintenance of specialized software for banking, business license and other accounting needs; and
- Performs other duties as assigned.

The director denied the petition, finding that the petitioner had satisfied none of the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), and therefore had not established that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner indicates that the “preponderance of the evidence” standard is relevant to this matter, and that the petitioner clearly established through credible and uncontested evidence that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Counsel also argues that the proffered duties come under the section in the *Handbook* on accountants and auditors. Additionally, counsel states that the director erroneously classified the proffered position as an accounting clerk position.

With respect to the preponderance of the evidence standard, *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-376 (AAO 2010), states in pertinent part the following:

Except where a different standard is specified by law, a petitioner or applicant in administrative immigration proceedings must prove by a preponderance of evidence that he or she is eligible for the benefit sought.

\* \* \*

The “preponderance of the evidence” standard requires that the evidence demonstrate that the applicant’s claim is “probably true,” where the determination of “truth” is made based on the factual circumstances of each individual case.

\* \* \*

Thus, in adjudicating the application pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, the director must examine each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true.

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the petitioner submits relevant, probative, and credible evidence that leads the director to believe that the claim is "more likely than not" or "probably" true, the applicant or petitioner has satisfied the standard of proof. *See INS v. Cardoza-Foncesca*, 480 U.S. 421, 431 (1987) (discussing "more likely than not" as a greater than 50% chance of an occurrence taking place). If the director can articulate a material doubt, it is appropriate for the director to either request additional evidence or, if that doubt leads the director to believe that the claim is probably not true, deny the application or petition.

Applying the preponderance of the evidence standard, the AAO disagrees with the director and finds that the proffered position's duties most closely relate to the *Handbook's* description of accountants and auditors. However, as previously discussed, the *Handbook* indicates that accountants do not constitute an occupational group that categorically requires a specialty-occupation level of education, that is, at least a U.S. bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Furthermore, the proffered job duties as described by the petitioner are vague and generic. For example, the petitioner claims the beneficiary will be responsible for such functions as payroll and control systems as well as the preparation and analysis of financial statements, accounts payable, and accounts receivable, but it does not provide any details or specifics with regard to what such responsibilities would entail on a day-to-day basis. In addition, such a general description does not provide sufficient information for the AAO to make any findings with regard to the level of responsibility of the proffered position, the complexity of the position relative to bookkeepers, accounting clerks, or accountants who perform these same duties, albeit at different levels of responsibility, and the education required to perform these vague duties.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the record of proceeding fails to establish that any accounting duties to be performed by the beneficiary would require the theoretical and practical application of a highly specialized accounting knowledge attained by at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in accounting, as required by the Act and its implementing regulations regarding a position's qualification as an H-1B specialty occupation.

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

---

<sup>2</sup> The AAO notes, however, that the position may be deemed at most to be an entry-level accounting position. This finding is based on the Level I designation made by the petitioner on the Labor Condition Application submitted in support of the petition. According to the DOL, a Level I designation is made for beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation and who perform routine tasks under close supervision.

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 at 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.

As the *Handbook* indicates that the proffered position does not belong to an occupational classification for which there is a categorical requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, and as the duties of the proffered position as described in the record of proceeding do not indicate that the particular position proffered in this petition is one for which a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty is normally the minimum requirement for entry, the petitioner failed to satisfy the first criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Next, the AAO finds that 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 requires a petitioner to establish that a bachelor's degree, in a specific specialty, is common to the petitioner's industry in positions that are both: (1) parallel to the proffered position; and (2) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

Again, 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 at 1165 (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. at 1102).

Here and as already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* reports an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent.

In support of its assertion that its degree requirement is common to the petitioner's industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, the petitioner submitted three letters from manufacturing and marketing textile firms. The letters provided only indicate that a bachelor's degree is generally required. The letters do not indicate that at a minimum a bachelor's degree or the equivalent in a *specific specialty* is required for the proffered position. Thus, petitioner has not established that similar companies in the same industry routinely require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for parallel positions.

The petitioner also submitted copies of five advertisements as evidence that its degree requirement is standard amongst its peer organizations for parallel positions in the manufacturing and marketing textile industry. The advertisements provided, however, establish at best that a bachelor's degree is generally required, but not at least a bachelor's degree or the equivalent in a *specific specialty*. In addition, even if all of the job postings indicated that a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent were required, the petitioner fails to establish that the submitted

advertisements are relevant in that the posted job announcements are not for parallel positions in similar organizations in the same industry. For instance, the first advertisement is for a position in a different industry and a dissimilar organization and, thus, it cannot be found to be a parallel position. Furthermore, it is unclear from the rest of the advertisements what industry the hiring companies are in and whether they would be similar to the petitioner and, as such, it also cannot be determined whether the jobs would be considered parallel to that of the proffered position. As a result, the petitioner has not established that similar companies in the same industry routinely require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for parallel positions.<sup>3</sup>

For the reasons discussed above, the petitioner has not satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The petitioner also failed to 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." Here, the record fails to sufficiently develop relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position of accountant. As the petitioner has thus failed to differentiate or otherwise distinguish its proffered position from general accountant positions as described in the *Handbook*, the evidence of record does not refute the *Handbook's* information to the effect that a bachelor's degree is not required in a specific specialty. The petitioner has therefore failed to establish that it meets the requirements of the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

Next, the record of proceeding does not establish a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proffered position only persons with at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty. Therefore, the petitioner has not satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Although the size of the relevant study population is unknown, the petitioner fails to demonstrate what statistically valid inferences, if any, can be drawn from just five job advertisements with regard to determining the common educational requirements for entry into parallel positions in similar manufacturing and marketing textiles companies. See generally Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research* 186-228 (1995). Moreover, given that there is no indication that the advertisements were randomly selected, the validity of any such inferences could not be accurately determined even if the sampling unit were sufficiently large. See *id.* at 195-196 (explaining that "[r]andom selection is the key to [the] process [of probability sampling]" and that "random selection offers access to the body of probability theory, which provides the basis for estimates of population parameters and estimates of error").

As such, even if the job announcements supported the finding that the position of accountant for a 7-person textile company required a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent, it cannot be found that such a limited number of postings that appear to have been consciously selected could credibly refute the statistics-based findings of the *Handbook* published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that such a position does not require at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty for entry into the occupation in the United States.

<sup>4</sup> While a petitioner may believe or otherwise assert that a proffered position requires a degree, that opinion alone without corroborating evidence cannot establish the position as a specialty occupation.

The fourth criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) requires a petitioner to establish that the nature of its 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. Here, the AAO incorporates by reference and reiterates its earlier discussions about the generalized and generic nature of the petitioner's descriptions of the proposed duties. The petitioner has failed to establish that the duties of the proffered position are sufficiently specialized and complex such that their performance would require knowledge of accounting at a level usually associated with at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in accounting or a closely related specialty. The AAO, therefore, concludes that the proffered position failed to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

The AAO does not need to examine the issue of the beneficiary's qualifications, because the petitioner has not provided sufficient documentation to demonstrate that the position is a specialty occupation. In other words, the beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation. As discussed in this decision, the petitioner did not submit sufficient evidence regarding the proffered position to determine that it is a specialty occupation and, therefore, the issue of whether it will require a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty also cannot be determined. Therefore, the AAO need not and will not address the beneficiary's qualifications.

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. § 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

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

---

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 degree requirement is only symbolic and the proffered position does not in fact require such a specialty degree or its equivalent to perform its duties, the occupation 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").