

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly 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**



b2

DATE: **JUL 06 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,

*for Michael T. Kelly*  
Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, California Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. 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 cigar and novelty items retailer that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a systems analyst. Accordingly, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant 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, finding that the position was not a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner contends that the director's findings were erroneous, and submits a brief and additional evidence in support of these contentions.

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

The 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 job it is offering to the beneficiary meets the following statutory and regulatory requirements.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

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

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

The petitioner seeks the beneficiary's services as a systems analyst. According to the petitioner's letter of support dated March 20, 2009, the beneficiary's proposed duties are as follows:

- Conduct research, design, develop and maintain computer systems and programs for monitoring cigar and cigarette inventory and network while supporting multiple work stations and terminals at multiple locations (overall responsibility).
- Develop and maintain computer systems that ensure fluid data flow and database security, through [REDACTED] Programming and [REDACTED] Programming (30%).
- Design, develop and maintain computer network and environment including computer hardware and systems software also including our inventory and database updates (20%).
- Design and maintain the network of software and databases for the storage and retrieval of specific client information and order details (20%).
- Monitor system performance, before and after program implementation, in order to prevent reoccurrence of program operating errors (10%).
- Install system updates and conduct tests to verify that the system can achieve maximum performance. Conduct compatibility tests with existing software (10%).
- Prepare instructional manual and provide ongoing technical support for employees as necessary (10%).

The petitioner further stated that the position requires at least a bachelor's degree in computer science, computer information systems, computer engineering, electrical engineering, or a related field. Regarding the beneficiary, the petitioner claimed that he possessed a bachelor of science degree in computer engineering and electrical engineering from the University of [REDACTED] at Irvine.

The director found the initial evidence insufficient, and consequently issued an RFE on May 7, 2009. The director requested additional evidence demonstrating that the position was a specialty occupation, and further requested additional details regarding the petitioner's business. In a response dated June 1, 2009, the petitioner responded to the petitioner's requests. The petitioner

restated the above list of duties when discussing the nature of the proffered position, and submitted copies of job postings for positions which it claimed were parallel to that of the proffered position in organizations similar to the petitioner.

On July 14, 2009, the director denied the petition, finding that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation. The director found further that the petitioner failed to establish any of the criteria found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner contends that the proffered position is in fact a specialty occupation, and argues that the director's denial was arbitrary and based on a misapplication of existing facts. No additional documentation is submitted in support of the appeal.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has established none of the four criteria outlined in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Therefore, the proffered position is not a specialty occupation.

To make its determination as to whether the employment described above qualifies as a specialty occupation, the AAO turns first to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1), which requires that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position. Factors considered by the AAO when determining this criterion include whether the Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, on which the AAO routinely relies for the educational requirements of particular occupations, reports the industry requires a degree in a specific specialty.

The petitioner has stated that the proffered position is that of a systems analyst. The critical element in examining whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation is not the title of the position or 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 bachelor's degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act. With regard to the instant petition, the record does not clearly establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation position.

The applicable section of the 2010-2011 edition of the *Handbook* is entitled "Computer Systems Analysts," and describes this occupational category in relevant part as follows:

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 helping an

organization select the proper system hardware and software are often called *system architects* or *system designers*. 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.

The *Handbook* states the following with regard to academic credentials for computer systems analysts:

Training requirements for computer systems analysts vary depending on the job, but many employers prefer applicants who have a bachelor's degree. Relevant work experience also is very important. Advancement opportunities are good for those with the necessary skills and experience.

***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.

According to the *Handbook*, a baccalaureate or higher degree, or the equivalent, *in a specific specialty* is not required for entry into the position. While the *Handbook* states that many employers prefer a bachelor's degree as the minimum academic preparation for this occupational category, this statement does not equate to a requirement for a bachelor's degree. Moreover, the *Handbook* also provides that a degree in a variety of disciplines is acceptable. When a job, like that of a computer systems analyst, can be performed by a range of degrees or a degree of generalized title, without further specification, the position does not qualify as a specialty occupation. See *Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm. 1988). To prove that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of specialized knowledge as required by Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, a petitioner must establish that the position requires the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specialized field of study. USCIS interprets the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(A)(1) to require a degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position. Since there must be a close correlation between the required specialized studies and the position, the requirement of a degree with a generalized title, without further specification, does not establish the position as a specialty occupation. See *Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm. 1988).

For the reasons discussed above, the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

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. 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 stated above, there is no requirement for a bachelor's degree in a *specific specialty* recognized by the *Handbook*.

The record also does not include any documentation from professional associations or individuals or firms in the industry regarding an industry standard.

With regard to parallel positions in similar cigar and cigarette retailers, counsel relies on submitted internet job postings from a wide variety of companies. This evidence, however, fails to establish

that a specific baccalaureate degree is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. Likewise, the various job postings submitted fail to satisfy this criterion for several reasons. First, four of the six postings are for the position of programmer analyst, not systems analyst, and are therefore not considered to be parallel to the proffered position since the duties of a programmer analyst vary from those of a systems analyst. Second, the two postings for the position of systems analyst are from companies dissimilar to that of the petitioner. Specifically, [REDACTED] is a communications, integration, and engineering solutions provider, and Northrop Grumman<sup>2</sup> is a designer, systems integrator and manufacturer of military aircraft, defense electronics, precision weapons, commercial and military aerostructures. Consequently, these companies cannot be deemed similar organizations to that of the petitioner, a cigar and cigarette retailer with three employees. Finally, even if these companies were similar organizations to the petitioner, neither of these postings requires a degree in a specific specialty. Instead, they require only generally a bachelor's degree without specifying a concentration or field in which that degree must be obtained. The postings, therefore, fail to establish that a specific baccalaureate degree in a *specific specialty* is a common industry-wide requirement.

In the alternative, the petitioner may show that the proffered position is so complex or unique that only an individual with a degree can perform the work associated with the position under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). The petitioner has submitted no evidence and made no attempt to explain how the performance of the beneficiary's duties within the petitioner's retail establishment is so complex or unique that only a degreed individual could perform such tasks. Further, the AAO also finds that neither the duty descriptions provided by the petitioner nor any other evidence in the record of proceeding develops complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position so as to distinguish it from other systems analyst positions performed by persons without at least a bachelor's degree in a related specific specialty. Therefore, the petitioner has likewise failed to establish the second prong of the referenced criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The AAO now turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) – the employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position. In response to the RFE, the petitioner claimed that it cannot disclose any information pertaining to its hiring practices and/or the academic credentials of its employees due to privacy and confidentiality laws. The petitioner, therefore, has failed to establish that it routinely hires only degreed individuals for the proffered position, and thus cannot prevail under this criterion.

Second, the petitioner's reliance on its requirement that the incumbent hold a bachelor's degree in computer science, computer information systems, computer engineering, electrical engineering, or a related field is insufficient to meet the requirements of this criterion. The AAO notes that 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. Were USCIS limited solely to reviewing a petitioner's self-imposed requirements, then any individual with

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.arinc.com/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.northropgrumman.com/>

a bachelor's degree could be brought to the United States to perform any occupation as long as the employer required the individual to have a baccalaureate or higher degree. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 384. As noted above, however, the petitioner states that an individual with a bachelor's degree in a variety of fields can perform the duties of the proffered position. Accordingly, 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.

The fourth criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) requires that the petitioner establish that the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree. The duties of the position described encompass routine duties attributed to computer systems analysts. While the petitioner claims that the duties of the proffered position are sufficiently complex, the record does not contain explanations or clarifying data sufficient to elevate the position to one that is so specialized and complex that the knowledge to perform these additional tasks is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty.

To the extent that they are depicted in the record, the duties of the position appear generic, with the use of such terms as "conduct research, design, develop and maintain computer systems" or "monitor system performance." While the petitioner contends that the duties of the position are complex and specialized, the petitioner provides no explanation of why or in what context such contracts would be viewed as either complex or specialized. The petitioner provided no further detail as to any specialized or complex duties that the beneficiary would perform as a systems analyst for a cigar and cigarette retailer. Without more persuasive evidence, the petitioner has not established the fourth criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Based on the record of proceeding, the AAO determines that the petitioner has not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. 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.

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