

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

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



82

DATE: **DEC 16 2011** OFFICE: VERMONT 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 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 remain denied.

The petitioner represented itself on the Form I-129 as a software development and consulting company with over 250 employees. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a systems analyst 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 on the basis of his determination that the petitioner failed to demonstrate: (1) that it had submitted an itinerary; (2) that it had submitted a certified labor condition application (LCA) valid for all work locations; and (3) that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. On appeal, the petitioner's corporate counsel contends that the director erred in denying the petition. The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). Upon review of the entire record, we find that the petitioner has failed to overcome the director's grounds for denying this petition. Beyond the decision of the director, we find additionally that the petitioner has failed to demonstrate: (1) that the petition is supported by an LCA which corresponds to it; and (2) that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

In its October 13, 2008 letter of support, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary would work at its business premises, which are located in Monmouth Junction, New Jersey, and submitted an LCA certified for employment in Monmouth Junction between October 1, 2008 and September 30, 2011. The petitioner proposed the following duties for the beneficiary:

- Analyzing user requirements, procedures, and problems in order to improve existing systems;
- Designing, developing, and implementing customized business software applications using Java, J2EE, Weblogic, Websphere, Apache, Tomcat, Swing, XML/XSLT, Tibco, Struts etc. on Unix, Sun Solaris, or Windows 2000/NT/XP; and
- Conducting studies pertaining to the development of new information systems in order to meet current and projected needs.

The director issued a request for additional evidence (RFE) on March 25, 2009 and requested, *inter alia*, that the petitioner clarify its employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary. Specifically, the director requested that if the beneficiary were going to work on an in-house project for the petitioner, as the petitioner had represented to be the case, the petitioner was required to submit detailed information regarding the project. In the alternative, if the beneficiary were going to perform services for the petitioner's clients at their locations of business, the petitioner was to submit an itinerary with the dates and locations of the services to be performed, along with copies of the contract with the end-user of the beneficiary's services or a letter from the end-user addressing the specific services to be performed by the beneficiary. The director also notified the petitioner that if it did not have a contract directly with the end-user, it was to submit the succession of contracts from the petitioner to the end-user.

In its April 14, 2009 letter submitted in response to the RFE, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary would no longer be working at its premises, as it had stated in its earlier letter.

According to the petitioner, the beneficiary began working at its business premises on January 1, 2009, but began working for Citi Global Markets shortly thereafter, and then began working for Citibank on January 27, 2009. Among other items, he petitioner submitted information regarding the project upon which the beneficiary had been working, in-house, as well as a copy of a January 27, 2009 agreement with Polaris Software Lab Limited (Polaris) and corresponding contract schedule (schedule) which called for the beneficiary to perform services for Polaris's client, Citigroup, in Long Island City, New York, beginning on January 27, 2009. The petitioner did not submit a letter from the end-user, Citigroup, as requested. Instead, the petitioner stated that Citigroup was "unable to provide any letter about this and [sic] project at this time." The petitioner also submitted an LCA certified on September 2, 2008 for employment in New York, New York between September 2, 2008 and September 2, 2011.

The petitioner's general counsel stated on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal, that the beneficiary "joined" the petitioner on January 19, 2009, and began working for Citigroup on that date. According to counsel, the beneficiary worked at Citigroup's locations in New York, New York and Warren, New Jersey.

Before addressing any of the substantive issues before us on appeal, we note discrepancies in the petitioner's account of the beneficiary's work history. As noted, the petitioner stated in its April 14, 2009 letter that the beneficiary began working at its premises on an in-house project on January 1, 2009, but began working for Citi Global Markets shortly thereafter, and then began working for Citibank on January 27, 2009. However, on appeal, counsel's assertions on the Form I-290B indicate that the beneficiary never worked for the petitioner directly but instead began working for Citigroup immediately. Also, the dates provided regarding the beneficiary's commencement of employment are not consistent. 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). Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Id.* at 591. For this reason alone, the petition may not be approved.

The Proposed Position Does Not Qualify for Classification as a Specialty Occupation

We will first address the director's third ground for denial of the petition: his determination that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. We find first that the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that, at the time it filed the petition, it had secured work of any type for the beneficiary to perform during the requested period of employment either within its organization as an employee contributing services to an in-house project or for an another organization pursuant to a consulting or similar agreement. Although the petitioner submitted information regarding an in-house project – the RiaEnjolie project – and claimed that the beneficiary would be working on that project, it failed to explain the beneficiary's expected contributions to the project in any meaningful way. The petitioner, therefore, failed to demonstrate that it had any in-house work for the beneficiary to perform during the period of requested employment. With regard to the services to be performed for Citi Global Markets/

Citibank/Citigroup, we note that, as recognized by the court in *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 387 (5th Cir. 2000), where the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner, evidence of the client companies' job requirements is critical. The court in that case held that the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service had reasonably interpreted the statute and regulations as requiring the petitioner to produce evidence that a proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation on the basis of the requirements imposed by the entities using the beneficiary's services. *Id.* at 387-388. Such evidence must be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate the type and educational level of highly specialized knowledge in a specific discipline that is necessary to perform that particular work. Here, the consulting agreement between the petitioner and Polaris was signed by the representative of the petitioner on January 15, 2009 and by the representative of Polaris on January 27, 2009, several months after the petition was filed on October 17, 2008, and the schedule between the petitioner and Polaris calling for the beneficiary to work for Citigroup was also executed in January 2009.¹ However, USCIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. See 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(12). A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978). The petitioner, therefore, has not established that a position actually existed as of the date the petition was filed, and a nonexistent position cannot qualify for classification as a specialty occupation.

However, even if the petitioner were to demonstrate, which it did not, that there actually existed work to be performed at the time the petition was filed, the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the proposed position qualifies for classification 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 one 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:

An occupation which requires [1] theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited

¹ Despite the director's specific request for the full succession of contracts between the petitioner and the end-user of the beneficiary's services (in this case, Citigroup), the record still lacks copies of any contractual agreements between Polaris and Citigroup. The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). This matter alone mandates denial of the petition.

to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires [2] 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 (5th 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 proposed 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.

In making our determination as to whether a proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation, we turn first 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 Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, a resource upon which we routinely rely 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 pertinent part, the *Handbook* states the following regarding systems analysts:

Nearly all organizations rely on computer and information technology (IT) to conduct business and operate efficiently. *Computer systems analysts* use IT tools to help enterprises of all sizes achieve their goals. They may design and develop new computer systems by choosing and configuring hardware and software, or they may devise ways to apply existing systems' resources to additional tasks.

Most systems analysts work with specific types of computer systems—for example, business, accounting, and financial systems or scientific and engineering systems—that vary with the kind of organization . . . Analysts who specialize in developing and fine-tuning systems often have the more general title of *systems analysts*.

To begin an assignment, systems analysts consult with an organization's managers and users to define the goals of the system and then design a system to meet those goals. They specify the inputs that the system will access, decide how the inputs will be processed, and format the output to meet users' needs. Analysts use techniques such as structured analysis, data modeling, information engineering, mathematical model building, sampling, and a variety of accounting principles to ensure their plans are efficient and complete. They also may prepare cost-benefit and return-on-investment analyses to help management decide whether implementing the proposed technology would be financially feasible.

When a system is approved, systems analysts oversee the implementation of the required hardware and software components. They coordinate tests and observe the initial use of the system to ensure that it performs as planned. They prepare specifications, flow charts, and process diagrams for computer programmers to follow; then they work with programmers to “debug,” or eliminate errors, from the system. Systems analysts who do more in-depth testing may be called *software quality assurance analysts*. In addition to running tests, these workers diagnose problems, recommend solutions, and determine whether program requirements have been met. After the system has been implemented, tested, and debugged, computer systems analysts may train its users and write instruction manuals.

* * *

One challenge created by expanding computer use is the need for different computer systems to communicate with each other. Many systems analysts are involved with “networking,” connecting all the computers within an organization or across organizations, as when setting up e-commerce networks to facilitate business between companies.

Handbook, 2010-11 ed., available at <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos287.htm> (last accessed December 2011). The duties and responsibilities proposed for the beneficiary are largely encompassed within those described by the *Handbook* as normally performed by systems analysts. Having made that determination, we turn next to the *Handbook's* findings regarding the educational requirements for systems analysts:

Training requirements for computer systems analysts vary depending on the job, but many employers prefer applicants who have a bachelor’s degree. . . .

Education and training. When hiring computer systems analysts, employers usually prefer applicants who have at least a bachelor’s degree. For more technically complex jobs, people with graduate degrees are preferred. For jobs in a technical or scientific environment, employers often seek applicants who have at least a bachelor’s degree in a technical field, such as computer science, information science, applied mathematics, engineering, or the physical sciences. For jobs in a business environment, employers often seek applicants with at least a bachelor’s degree in a business-related field such as management information systems (MIS). Increasingly, employers are seeking individuals who have a master’s degree in business administration (MBA) with a concentration in information systems.

Despite the preference for technical degrees, however, people who have degrees in other areas may find employment as systems analysts if they also have technical skills. Courses in computer science or related subjects combined with practical experience can qualify people for some jobs in the occupation.

Id. The *Handbook* explains unequivocally that a bachelor’s degree in a specific specialty is not the normal minimum requirement for entry as a systems analyst. The *Handbook* states that requirements vary, and that computer coursework combined with practical training is sufficient for

some systems analyst positions. Although the *Handbook* does indicate that some employers prefer a degree, we note that hiring preferences are not synonymous with hiring requirements, and the fact that an organization prefers to hire individuals with a degree does not necessarily mean that it is required. Moreover, of the positions that do require attainment of a bachelor's degree or equivalent, the findings from the *Handbook* indicate that a degree *in a specific specialty* would not be required.

To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, USCIS does not rely simply upon a proposed position's title. The specific duties of the 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 beneficiary, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner* 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 discussed, we have determined that the duties of the proposed largely mirror those listed in the *Handbook* among those normally performed by systems analysts. However, our review has found that this occupation does not normally impose a normal minimum entry requirement of a bachelor's degree in a specific field of study as required by section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

Nor would the petitioner have satisfied the first of the two alternative prongs at 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.

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)).

As already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proposed position is one for which the *Handbook* reports an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty. Further, the petitioner did not submit documentation to establish that similar firms routinely require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty for its positions like the one the petitioner is offering. For all of these reasons, the petitioner would not have satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The petitioner also would have 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." 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 record lacks sufficiently detailed information to distinguish the proffered position as unique from or more complex than similar positions that can be performed by persons without a specialty degree or its equivalent.

We turn next to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3), which requires that the petitioner demonstrate that it normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position. To determine a petitioner's ability to meet the third criterion, we normally review the petitioner's past employment practices, as well as the histories, including the names and dates of employment, of those employees with degrees who previously held the position, and copies of those employees' diplomas.² The petitioner, however has submitted no such evidence of a past hiring history of requiring a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific field of study. Accordingly, the petitioner would not have satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

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. We find that the evidence in the record of proceeding does not support the proposition that the performance of the proposed duties requires a higher degree of IT/computer knowledge than would normally be required of analysts not equipped with at least a bachelor's degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty. As a result, the petitioner would have failed to establish the proposed position meets the specialized and complex threshold at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

For the reasons related in the preceding discussion, the petitioner has failed to establish that its proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation under the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1)-(4). The AAO, therefore, affirms the director's determination that the petitioner failed to establish that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation.

The Remaining Grounds for Denial of the Petition

As discussed earlier, the director also denied the petition on the basis of his determination that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate: (1) that it had submitted an itinerary; and (2) that it had

² Even if a petitioner believes or otherwise assert that a proposed position requires a degree, that opinion alone without corroborating evidence cannot establish the position as a specialty occupation. 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 job so 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 proposed 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* section 214(i)(1) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "specialty occupation"). Here, the petitioner has failed to establish the referenced criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) based on its normal hiring practices.

submitted a certified LCA valid for all work locations. As the petitioner's failure to demonstrate the existence of a specialty occupation precludes approval of this petition, we need not address the remaining grounds of the director's denial of the petition. Therefore we affirm, but will not discuss, these remaining grounds of the director's decision.

The Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That The Petition Is Supported By An LCA Which Corresponds To It

Beyond the decision of the director, we note that the certified LCAs provided in support of the instant petition list a Level I prevailing wage level for systems analysts. This indicates that these LCA's, which are certified for an entry-level position, are at odds with the statements by the petitioner regarding the complexity of the duties to be performed by the beneficiary. Given that the LCA's submitted in support of the petition are for a Level I wage,³ it must therefore be concluded that either (1) the position is a low-level, entry position relative to other systems analysts; or that (2) the LCA's do not correspond to the proposed petition.

While the DOL is the agency that certifies LCA applications before they are submitted to USCIS, DOL regulations note that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (i.e., its immigration benefits branch, USCIS) is the department responsible for determining whether the content of an LCA filed for a particular Form I-129 actually supports that petition. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b), which states, in pertinent part, the following:

For H-1B visas . . . DHS accepts the employer's petition (DHS Form I-129) with the DOL certified LCA attached. *In doing so, the DHS determines whether the petition is supported by an LCA which corresponds with the petition*, whether the occupation named in the [LCA] is a specialty occupation or whether the individual is a fashion model of distinguished merit and ability, and whether the qualifications of the nonimmigrant meet the statutory requirements of H-1B visa classification.

(Italics added). The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b) requires that USCIS ensure an LCA actually supports the H-1B petition filed on behalf of the beneficiary. Here, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the petition is supported by an LCA which corresponds to the petition, and the petition must be denied for this additional reason.

³ According to guidance regarding wage level determination issued by the DOL in 2009 entitled *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, at page 7, Level I wage rates, which are labeled as "entry" 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."

The Beneficiary Is Not Qualified To Perform the Duties of a Specialty Occupation

Beyond the decision of the director, the petition may not be approved for an additional reason, as the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. The statutory and regulatory framework that the AAO must apply in its consideration of the evidence of the beneficiary's qualification to serve in a specialty occupation is set forth 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.

As the beneficiary did not earn a baccalaureate or higher degree from an accredited college or university in the United States, he does not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(1). As he does not possess a foreign degree that has been determined to be equivalent to a baccalaureate or higher degree from an accredited college or university in the United States, he does not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(2). As the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary holds an unrestricted state license, registration or certification to perform the duties of a specialty occupation, he does not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(3).

The petitioner, therefore, must establish that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4), which requires a demonstration that the beneficiary's education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience is equivalent to the completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation, and that the beneficiary also has recognition of that expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D), equating a beneficiary's credentials to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4) is determined by at least one 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 (PONSI);
- (3) An evaluation of education by a reliable credentials evaluation service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials;⁴
- (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.

⁴ The petitioner should note that, in accordance with this provision, the AAO will accept a credentials evaluation service's evaluation of *education only*, not experience.

As the record lacks an evaluation of the beneficiary's work experience, he does not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1).

No evidence has been submitted to establish, nor does the petitioner assert, that the beneficiary satisfies 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(2), which requires submission of 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 (PONSI).

Nor does the beneficiary qualify under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(3). As was the case under 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(1) and (2), the beneficiary is unqualified under this criterion because he did not earn a baccalaureate or higher degree from an accredited college or university in the United States and does not possess a foreign degree that has been determined to be equivalent to a baccalaureate or higher degree from an accredited college or university in the United States.

No evidence has been submitted to establish, nor does the petitioner assert, that the beneficiary satisfies 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(4), which requires that the beneficiary submit 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.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5) states the following with regard to analyzing an alien's qualifications:

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;⁵
- (ii) Membership in a recognized foreign or United States association or society in

⁵ *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. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

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.

Although the record contains evidence 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 proposed position; that it was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who held a bachelor's degree or its equivalent in the field; and that the beneficiary achieved recognition of expertise in the field 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. For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

Prior H-1B Approval Granted to the Beneficiary

Finally, counsel notes that the beneficiary was previously granted H-1B status. However, the AAO is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. If the previous petition was approved based on the same evidence contained in the current record, it would constitute material and gross error on the part of the director. The AAO is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. *See, e.g., Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 597 (Comm'r 1988). It would be absurd to suggest that USCIS or any agency must treat acknowledged errors as binding precedent. *Sussex Engg. Ltd. v. Montgomery*, 825 F.2d 1084, 1090 (6th Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 485 U.S. 1008 (1988). A prior approval does not compel the approval of a subsequent petition or relieve the petitioner of its burden to provide sufficient documentation to establish current eligibility for the benefit sought. 55 Fed. Reg. 2606, 2612 (Jan. 26, 1990). A prior approval also does not preclude USCIS from denying an extension of an original visa petition based on a reassessment of eligibility for the benefit sought. *See Texas A&M Univ. v. Upchurch*, 99 Fed. Appx. 556, 2004 WL 1240482 (5th Cir. 2004). Furthermore, the AAO's authority over the service centers is comparable to the relationship between a court of appeals and a district court. Even if a service center director approved a nonimmigrant petition filed on behalf of a beneficiary, the AAO would not be bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. *Louisiana Philharmonic*

Orchestra v. INS, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D. La.), *aff'd*, 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S.Ct. 51 (2001).

Conclusion

The petitioner has failed to demonstrate to demonstrate: (1) that it submitted an itinerary; (2) that it had a certified LCA valid for all work locations; and (3) that its proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. Beyond the decision of the director, we find additionally that the petitioner has failed to demonstrate: (1) that the petition is supported by an LCA which corresponds to it; and (2) that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.⁶ Accordingly, the beneficiary is ineligible for nonimmigrant classification under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act and this petition must remain denied.

The petition will remain 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, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met and the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

⁶ An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO 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 at 145 (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).