


(b)(6)

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




DATE: DEC 02 2013 OFFICE: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
 Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the
 Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:




INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements.** See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,


Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner submitted a Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129) to the Vermont Service Center on August 30, 2012. The Form I-129 visa petition and supporting documentation indicates that the petitioner is a gas station and convenience store established in 1999. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as an accountant position, the petitioner seeks to classify him as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition on November 20, 2012, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. On appeal, counsel asserts that the director's basis for denial of the petition was erroneous and contends that the petitioner satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

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

For the reasons that will be discussed below, the AAO agrees with the director that the petitioner has not established eligibility for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director's decision will not be disturbed. The appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

Later in this decision, the AAO will also discuss two additional, independent grounds, not identified by the director's decision, that the AAO finds also preclude approval of this petition. Specifically, beyond the decision of the director, the AAO finds that the petitioner (1) failed to establish that it would pay an adequate salary for the beneficiary's work, as required under the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions; and (2) failed to submit a Labor Condition Application (LCA) that corresponds to the petition. Thus, the petition cannot be approved for these reasons as well. They are considered independent and alternative bases for denial of the petition.¹

In this matter, the petitioner stated in the Form I-129 petition that it seeks the beneficiary's services as an accountant to work on a full-time basis. In a support letter dated June 22, 2012, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary will perform the following duties in the proffered position:

In this position, [the beneficiary's] specific duties will include: (i) compiling and analyzing financial information and preparing financial reports by applying principles of generally accepted accounting standards; (ii) preparing entries and reconciling general ledger accounts, documenting transactions, and summarizing

¹ The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

current and projected financial position; (iii) maintaining payable and receivable records, detailing assets, liabilities, capital, and preparing detailed balance sheet, profit & loss, and cash flow statement; (iv) Auditing orders, contracts, individual transactions and preparing depreciation schedules to apply to capital assets; (v) preparing compliance reports for taxing authorities; and (vi) analyzing operating statements, review cost control programs, and make strategy recommendations to management.

The AAO notes that the petitioner has described the duties of the beneficiary's employment in the same general terms as those used from various sources on the Internet, including excerpts from the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)*. That is, the AAO notes that the wording of the above duties as provided by the petitioner for the proffered position is recited almost verbatim from other sources. This type of generalized description may be appropriate when defining the range of duties that may be performed within an occupational category, but it fails to adequately convey the substantive work that the beneficiary will perform within the petitioner's business operations and, thus, generally cannot be relied upon by a petitioner when discussing the duties attached to specific employment for H-1B approval. In establishing a position as a specialty occupation, a petitioner must describe the specific duties and responsibilities to be performed by a beneficiary, demonstrate a legitimate need for an employee exists, and substantiate that it has H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary for the period of employment requested in the petition.

Moreover, the AAO notes that the petitioner did not provide any information with regard to the order of importance and/or frequency of occurrence with which the beneficiary will perform the functions and tasks. Thus, the petitioner failed to specify which tasks were major functions of the proffered position and it did not establish the frequency with which each of the duties would be performed (e.g., regularly, periodically or at irregular intervals). As a result, the petitioner did not establish the primary and essential functions of the proffered position.

In its letter of support accompanying the initial Form I-129 petition, the petitioner stated the following regarding the requirements of the proffered position:

Due to the complex and demanding requirements of an Accountant, only a person of exceptional ability and skills in computer science is capable of qualifying as an Accountant for [the petitioner]. These minimum prerequisites for the offered position require a skilled professional with a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration, Accounting, Finance, or a related field.

The petitioner indicated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in the proffered position by virtue of his foreign degrees and his experience working for the petitioner since 2009. The petitioner further stated that the beneficiary's "years of employment reflect experience and training in positions of increasing responsibility." The petitioner provided a copy of the beneficiary's foreign diplomas and transcripts, and an evaluation of the beneficiary's credentials prepared by [redacted] that indicates that the beneficiary has "attained the equivalent of a Bachelor of Business Administration degree from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States."

In addition, the petitioner submitted an LCA in support of the instant H-1B petition. The AAO notes that the LCA designation for the proffered position corresponds to the occupational classification "Accountants and Auditors" - SOC (ONET/OES) code 13-2011, at a Level I (entry level) wage.

The director found the initial evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued an RFE on September 11, 2012. The AAO notes that the director specifically requested that the petitioner submit probative evidence to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. In addition, the director requested evidence to establish how the beneficiary would be relieved from performing non-qualifying duties (as the petitioner employs five employees). The director outlined the evidence to be submitted.

On November 8, 2012, the petitioner and counsel responded to the director's RFE by providing a brief and additional evidence, including: (1) tax documents;² (2) business licenses; (3) invoices; (4) select quarterly wage reports from 2011 and 2012; (5) the petitioner's bank account statements;³ (6) a printout from the Foreign Labor Certification Data Center Online Wage Library; (7) an excerpt from the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* regarding "Accountants and Auditors"; (8) copies of several job postings;⁴ (9) advertisements for the proffered position; (10) Form W-2, Wage and Tax Statements, for 2010 and 2011 issued to the beneficiary; (11) a document entitled "Earnings Statement" for the beneficiary from June 2012 to August 2012; and (12) copies of previously submitted documents.

The AAO observes that in its letter provided in response to the RFE, the petitioner claims that the proffered position is "a professional position and would normally be filled by a graduate with a

² The petitioner submitted its 2010 and 2011 tax returns. The tax returns were not prepared by the beneficiary. Rather, [REDACTED] a self-employed individual, prepared the documents on behalf of the petitioner.

³ The AAO notes that the balance for the bank statements is as follows:

July 31, 2012	\$45,952.31
August 31, 2012	\$21,997.65

The petitioner provided photocopies of deposit slips and cancelled checks. Although the petitioner has indicated that the beneficiary has served as the petitioner's accountant since 2009, none of the checks or deposit slips bear the beneficiary's signature. Rather, the vast majority appear to have been signed with the last name [REDACTED]. The petitioner's July bank statement reveals a check dated July 1, 2012 in the name of [REDACTED] for the amount of \$3,797.75. The memo line of the check contains what appears to be a net salary calculation. Although in the RFE the director requested that the petitioner provide job descriptions for the positions in the petitioner's organization, the petitioner failed to provide this information. No explanation was provided as to [REDACTED] role in the petitioner's organization.

⁴ The AAO observes that the petitioner provided photocopies of job announcements that are partially or completely illegible. The AAO will not attempt to decipher or "guess" the meaning or the probative value of information provided in poor, illegible photocopies.

minimum of a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration, or a related area, or the equivalent." No explanation was provided for the variance from the petitioner's prior statement regarding the academic requirement for the proffered position.

The petitioner also provided a revised description of the duties of the proffered position, along with the approximate percentage of time that the beneficiary will spend performing each duty. Notably, the expanded description describes duties common to the occupational category rather than the specific duties of this particular position (i.e., "[c]ommon duties for accountants..."; "[t]hey monitor..."; "[t]heir duties..."; "[a]ccountants are responsible . . ."; "[t]he majority of an accountant's day is spent . . ."; "[t]hese managers and supervisors oversee . . ."; "[t]hey must oversee all aspects of the accounting department . . .").

The director reviewed the information provided in response to the RFE. Although the petitioner claimed that the beneficiary would serve in a specialty occupation, the director determined that the petitioner failed to establish how the beneficiary's immediate duties would necessitate services at a level requiring the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's degree level of a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty. The director denied the petition on November 20, 2012. Counsel for the petitioner submitted an appeal of the denial of the H-1B petition.

The issue before the AAO is whether the petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. Based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, the AAO will make some preliminary findings that are material to the determination of the merits of this appeal.

To ascertain the intent of a petitioner USCIS must look to the Form I-129 and the documents filed in support of the petition. It is only in this manner that the agency can determine the exact position offered, the location of employment, the proffered wage, et cetera. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(9)(i), the director has the responsibility to consider all of the evidence submitted by a petitioner and such other evidence that he or she may independently require to assist his or her adjudication. Further, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv) provides that "[a]n H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation shall be accompanied by [d]ocumentation . . . or any other required evidence sufficient to establish . . . that the services the beneficiary is to perform are in a specialty occupation."

Moreover, the AAO finds that the petitioner describes the proposed duties in terms of generalized and generic functions that fail to convey sufficient substantive information to establish the relative complexity, uniqueness and/or specialization of the proffered position or its duties. The abstract level of information provided about the proffered position and its constituent duties is exemplified by the petitioner's assertion that the beneficiary will be responsible for "compiling and analyzing financial information and preparing financial reports." The statement fails to provide insight into the beneficiary's actual duties, nor does it include any information regarding the specific tasks that the beneficiary will perform. Additionally, the petitioner claims that the beneficiary will be responsible for "preparing entries and reconciling general ledger accounts, documenting transactions, and summarizing current and projected financial position." Notably, the petitioner

fails to demonstrate how the performance of these duties, as described in the record, would require the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The petitioner further claims that the beneficiary will be responsible for "preparing compliance reports for taxing authorities" and "analyzing operating statements, review cost control programs, and make strategy recommendations to management." The petitioner's statements fail to convey any pertinent details as to the actual work involved in these tasks. The petitioner does not explain the beneficiary's specific role and how his work will be conducted and/or applied within the scope of the petitioner's business operations. Furthermore, the petitioner fails to convey how a baccalaureate level of education (or higher) in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, would be required to perform these tasks. Thus, the overall responsibilities for the proffered position contain generalized functions without providing sufficient information regarding the particular work, and associated educational requirements, into which the duties would manifest themselves in their day-to-day performance within the petitioner's business operations.

Such generalized information does not in itself establish a necessary correlation between any dimension of the proffered position and a need for a particular level of education, or educational equivalency, in a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty. The AAO also observes, therefore, that it is not evident that the proposed duties as described in this record of proceeding, and the position that they comprise, merit recognition of the proffered position as a specialty occupation. To the extent that they are described, the proposed duties do not provide a sufficient factual basis for conveying the substantive matters that would engage the beneficiary in the actual performance of the proffered position for the entire three-year period requested, so as to persuasively support the claim that the position's actual work would require the theoretical and practical application of any particular educational level of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the proffered position.

As such, the description of the job duties provided by the petitioner conveys only generalized functions of the occupational category at a generic level. The petitioner fails to convey either the substantive nature of the work that the beneficiary would actually perform in the context of the petitioner's business operations, any particular body of highly specialized knowledge that would have to be theoretically and practically applied to perform the duties, or the educational level of any such knowledge that may be necessary. The responsibilities for the proffered position contain generalized functions without providing sufficient information regarding the particular work, and associated educational requirements, into which the duties would manifest themselves in their day-to-day performance within the petitioner's business operations.

Although the beneficiary has served in the proffered position for approximately three years, the petitioner did not provide sufficient documentation to establish the claimed job duties and responsibilities of the proffered position. That is, the petitioner did not submit probative evidence to substantiate the beneficiary's work product, nor did the petitioner submit financial documentation regarding the company's business operations aside from the above referenced 2010 and 2011 tax returns (prepared by another individual), quarterly wage reports (regarding 4 to 6 employees), approximately 10 invoices, and bank statements (as previously discussed). The record of proceeding lacks documentation regarding the petitioner's business activities and the actual work

that the beneficiary will perform to substantiate the claim that the petitioner has H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary for the period of employment requested in the petition.⁵ For an H-1B petition to be granted, the petitioner must provide sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm'r 1972)).

That is, for H-1B approval, the petitioner must demonstrate a legitimate need for an employee exists and to substantiate that it has H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary for the period of employment requested in the petition. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to demonstrate it has sufficient work to require the services of a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or the equivalent, to perform duties at a level that requires the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's degree level of a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty for the period specified in the petition.

In the instant case, the petitioner claims that the beneficiary has served in the proffered position since 2009, however, the petitioner failed to provide sufficient details regarding the nature and scope of the beneficiary's employment or substantive evidence regarding the actual work that the beneficiary performs. Without a meaningful job description, the record lacks evidence sufficiently concrete and informative to demonstrate that the proffered position requires a specialty occupation's level of knowledge in a specific specialty. The tasks as described fail to communicate (1) the actual work that the beneficiary would perform, (2) the complexity, uniqueness and/or specialization of the tasks, and/or (3) the correlation between that work and a need for a particular level education of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty. The petitioner's assertion with regard to the educational requirement is conclusory and unpersuasive, as it is not supported by the job description or substantive evidence.

Furthermore, the AAO notes that it is reasonable to assume that the size of an employer's business has or could have an impact on the duties of a particular position. See *EG Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a/ Mexican Wholesale Grocery v Department of Homeland Security*, 467 F. Supp. 2d 728 (E.D. Mich. 2006). Thus, the size of a petitioner may be considered as a component of the nature of the petitioner's business, as the size impacts upon the duties of a particular position.⁶ In matters where a petitioner's business is relatively small, the AAO reviews the record for evidence that its operations, are, nevertheless, of sufficient complexity to indicate that it would employ the beneficiary in position requiring the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge that may be obtained only through a baccalaureate degree or higher in a specific

⁵ The AAO also observes that the director's decision notes the lengthy distance between the beneficiary's residence and the petitioner's locale, which according to counsel is "88 miles (75 minute) one way every day." (The website "Google Maps" indicates that the distance is "102 miles – about 1 hour 42 mins.") On appeal, counsel discusses various potential benefits of a long commute, but provided no evidence to demonstrate that the beneficiary has been making this extensive commute for the past three years.

⁶ In the instant case, the petitioner stated on the Form I-129 petition that it employs five people.

specialty, or its equivalent. Additionally, when a petitioner employs relatively few people, it may be necessary for the petitioner to establish how the beneficiary will be relieved from performing non-qualifying duties. The director specifically noted this issue; however, the petitioner and counsel elected not to address or provide probative documentation as to how the beneficiary will be relieved from performing non-qualifying duties. Further, the record of proceeding does not contain the job titles and job descriptions of the petitioner's other employees.

In addition, upon review of the record of proceeding, the AAO notes that the petitioner and counsel have provided inconsistent information regarding the minimum requirements for the proffered position. In the June 22, 2012 letter of support, the petitioner stated that the proffered position requires "Bachelor's degree in Business Administration, Accounting, Finance, or a related field." In response to the director's RFE, the petitioner stated in a letter dated November 2, 2012 that it requires "a graduate with a minimum of a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration, or a related area, or the equivalent. In a letter dated November 6, 2012, counsel claimed that the position requires "a graduate with a minimum of a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration, Accounting, or the equivalent."⁷ No explanation for the variance was provided.

Moreover, the petitioner and counsel state that a bachelor's degree in business administration is acceptable for the proffered position. USCIS interprets the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to require a degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proposed position. USCIS has consistently stated that, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a degree in business administration, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d at 147.⁸ Again, the petitioner and counsel in this matter claim that the duties of the proffered position can be performed by an individual with only a general-purpose bachelor's degree, i.e., a bachelor's degree in business administration. This assertion is tantamount to an admission that the proffered position

⁷ The AAO notes that in response to the RFE, counsel indicated that "[the petitioner] will also accept applicants with work experience in a similar skill set, equivalent to a Bachelor's degree." Counsel did not indicate how the petitioner determines academic equivalency. Thus, it is not apparent that the petitioner requires "the equivalent" of a bachelor's degree as described by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5).

⁸ Specifically, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit explained in *Royal Siam* that:

[t]he courts and the agency consistently have stated that, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a business administration degree, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify the granting of a petition for an H-1B specialty occupation visa. *See, e.g., Tapis Int'l v. INS*, 94 F.Supp.2d 172, 175-76 (D.Mass.2000); *Shanti*, 36 F. Supp.2d at 1164-66; *cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Assocs.*, 19 I & N Dec. 558, 560 ([Comm'r] 1988) (providing frequently cited analysis in connection with a conceptually similar provision). This is as it should be: otherwise, an employer could ensure the granting of a specialty occupation visa petition by the simple expedient of creating a generic (and essentially artificial) degree requirement.

Id.

is not in fact a specialty occupation. The director's decision must therefore be affirmed and the petition denied on this basis alone.

Further, in the instant case, the record of proceeding also contains discrepancies between what the petitioner claims about the level of responsibility inherent in the proffered position set against the contrary level of responsibility conveyed by the wage level indicated by the LCA submitted in support of petition. As previously noted, the petitioner submitted an LCA in support of the petition that designated the proffered position to the corresponding occupational category of "Accountants and Auditors" - SOC (ONET/OES) code 13-2011. The wage level for the proffered position in the LCA corresponds to a Level I (entry) position. The prevailing wage source is listed in the LCA as the OES (Occupational Employment Statistics) OFLC (Office of Foreign Labor Certification) Online Data Center.⁹ The LCA was certified on June 18, 2012 and signed by the petitioner on June 22, 2012. The AAO notes that by completing and submitting the LCA, and by signing the LCA, the petitioner attested that the information contained in the LCA was true and accurate.

Wage levels should be determined only after selecting the most relevant O*NET code classification. Then, a prevailing wage determination is made by selecting one of four wage levels for an occupation based on a comparison of the employer's job requirements to the occupational requirements, including tasks, knowledge, skills, and specific vocational preparation (education, training and experience) generally required for acceptable performance in that occupation.¹⁰

Prevailing wage determinations start with a Level I (entry) and progress to a wage that is commensurate with that of a Level II (qualified), Level III (experienced), or Level IV (fully competent) position after considering the job requirements, experience, education, special skills/other requirements and supervisory duties. Factors to be considered when determining the prevailing wage level for a position include the complexity of the job duties, the level of judgment, the amount and level of supervision, and the level of understanding required to perform the job duties.¹¹ DOL emphasizes that these guidelines should not be implemented in a mechanical fashion

⁹ The Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) program produces employment and wage estimates for over 800 occupations. See Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/oes/>. The OES All Industries Database is available at the Office of Foreign Labor Certification (OFLC) Data Center, which includes the Online Wage Library for prevailing wage determinations and the disclosure databases for the temporary and permanent programs. The Online Wage Library is accessible at <http://www.flcdatacenter.com/>.

¹⁰ For additional information regarding prevailing wage determinations, see U.S. Dep't of Labor, Emp't & Training Admin., *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagric. Immigration Programs (rev. Nov. 2009), available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf.

¹¹ A point system is used to assess the complexity of the job and assign the wage level. Step 1 requires a "1" to represent the job's requirements. Step 2 addresses experience and must contain a "0" (for at or below the level of experience and SVP range), a "1" (low end of experience and SVP), a "2" (high end), or "3" (greater than range). Step 3 considers education required to perform the job duties, a "1" (more than the usual education by one category) or "2" (more than the usual education by more than one category). Step 4 accounts for Special Skills requirements that indicate a higher level of complexity or decision-making with a

and that the wage level should be commensurate with the complexity of the tasks, independent judgment required, and amount of close supervision received.

The wage levels are defined in DOL's "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance." A Level I wage rate is described as follows:

Level I (entry) wage 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.

See U.S. Dep't of Labor, Emp't & Training Admin., *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagric. Immigration Programs (rev. Nov. 2009), available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf.

The AAO acknowledges that the petitioner and its counsel may believe that the duties of the proffered position are complex, unique and/or specialized. For instance, the AAO notes that in the June 22, 2012 letter of support, the petitioner references the "complex and demanding requirements of the position" and claims that "only a person of exceptional ability and skills in business administration is capable of qualifying as an Accountant for [the petitioner]."

Moreover, in the November 2, 2012 letter, submitted in response to the director's RFE, the petitioner claims that the specific responsibilities and knowledge of the position is "specialized and complex." Further, in a letter dated November 6, 2012, counsel states that the beneficiary "handles all the financial dealings of the Petitioner" and "has to utilize [a] high scale [of] knowledge in the field of budgeting, forecasting, taxation, asset allocation, etc." In addition, counsel references "the complexity of the voluminous transactions taking place [by the petitioner]." According to counsel, the beneficiary's "responsibilities primarily include managing and directing the financial activities, rather than performing [the] day-to-day bookkeeping function." Counsel also states, "In addition to supervising individuals who perform routine bookkeeping services, [the beneficiary] will spend [the] bulk of his time in establishing operational and financial security procedures and advising upper management with cost saving and investment strategies."¹²

"1" or a "2" entered as appropriate. Finally, Step 5 addresses Supervisory Duties, with a "1" entered unless supervision is generally required by the occupation.

¹² The Form I-129 indicates that the petitioner's business operations consist of five employees, which appear to include [redacted] (the president), Almas Jalaluddin (the president) and the beneficiary. Although the petitioner and counsel claim that the beneficiary's job duties include "supervising individuals who perform routine bookkeeping services," the petitioner has not provided the names and job titles of the subordinate

In response the RFE, the petitioner states that it seeks new opportunities and it "fears that it may not be able to meet the aggressive goals without assistance of an Accountant." Also in response to the RFE, counsel claims that the petitioner's success is "largely dependent" on the beneficiary "as the specialized duties of this individual directly and indirectly affect the company's operations, revenues, profits, and ultimately the overall success of the company."

On appeal, counsel states that the beneficiary "establishes and implements policies, goals, objectives, and procedures for [the petitioner's] financial operations." Counsel further reports that the beneficiary will "advise management in financial investment decisions to contribute to [the petitioner's] financial success."

The AAO observes that the petitioner and counsel indicate that the petitioner will be relying heavily on the beneficiary to make critical decisions regarding the petitioner's business. Such reliance on the beneficiary's work appears to surpass the expectations of a Level I position, as described above, in which the employee works under close supervision, performing routine tasks that require only a basic understanding of the occupation and has limited exercise of judgment. Here, rather than the beneficiary's work being "monitored and reviewed for accuracy," counsel indicates that the beneficiary will be supervising others and claims that the petitioner is relying on the beneficiary services to ensure the growth and success of the petitioner's business.

Thus, upon review of the assertions made by the petitioner and counsel, the AAO must question the level of complexity, independent judgment and understanding actually required for the proffered position as the LCA is certified for a Level I entry-level position. This characterization of the position and the claimed duties and responsibilities as described in the record of proceeding conflict with the wage-rate element of the LCA selected by the petitioner, which, as reflected in the discussion above, is indicative of a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupation. In accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels, this wage rate indicates that the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation; that he will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. As noted above, a job offer for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship is an indicator that a Level I wage should be considered.

Under the H-1B program, a petitioner must offer a beneficiary wages that are at least the actual wage level paid by the petitioner to all other individuals with similar experience and qualifications for the specific employment in question, or the prevailing wage level for the occupational classification in the area of employment, whichever is greater, based on the best information available as of the time of filing the application. See section 212(n)(1)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1)(A).

employees.

The AAO notes that the prevailing wage of \$38,376 per year on the LCA corresponds to a Level I for the occupational category of "Accountants and Auditors" for [REDACTED] Texas).¹³ The petitioner stated in the Form I-129 petition and LCA that the offered salary for the proffered position was \$38,376 per year. Notably, if the proffered position were designated as a higher level position, the prevailing wage at that time would have been \$49,858 per year for a Level II position, \$61,318 per year for a Level III position, and \$72,800 per year for a Level IV position.

The petitioner was required to provide, at the time of filing the H-1B petition, an LCA certified for the correct wage level in order for it to be found to correspond to the petition. To permit otherwise would result in a petitioner paying a wage lower than that required by section 212(n)(1)(A) of the Act, by allowing that petitioner to simply submit an LCA for a different wage level at a lower prevailing wage than the one that it claims it is offering to the beneficiary. As such, the petitioner has failed to establish that it would pay an adequate salary for the beneficiary's work, as required under the Act, if the petition were granted. Thus, even if it were determined that the petitioner overcame the director's ground for denying the petition (which it has not), for this reason also the H-1B petition cannot be approved. It is considered an independent and alternative basis for denial.

The AAO notes that this aspect of the LCA undermines the credibility of the petition, and, in particular, the credibility of the petitioner's assertions regarding the demands, level of responsibilities and requirements of the proffered position. 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).

As noted below, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B)(2) specifies that certification of an LCA does not constitute a determination that an occupation is a specialty occupation:

Certification by the Department of Labor of a labor condition application in an occupational classification does not constitute a determination by that agency that the occupation in question is a specialty occupation. The director shall determine if the application involves a specialty occupation as defined in section 214(i)(1) of the Act. The director shall also determine whether the particular alien for whom H-1B classification is sought qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation as prescribed in section 214(i)(2) of the Act.

While 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 an LCA filed for a particular

¹³ For additional information regarding the prevailing wage for accountants in [REDACTED] see the All Industries Database for 7/2011 - 6/2012 for Accountants and Auditors at the Foreign Labor Certification Data Center, Online Wage Library on the Internet at [REDACTED]

(last visited November 27, 2013).

Form I-129 actually supports that petition. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b), which states, in pertinent part (emphasis added):

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 . . . and whether the qualifications of the nonimmigrant meet the statutory requirements of H-1B visa classification.

The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b) requires that USCIS ensure that an LCA actually supports the H-1B petition filed on behalf of the beneficiary. Here, the petitioner has failed to submit a valid LCA that corresponds to the claimed duties and requirements of the proffered position, that is, specifically, that corresponds to the level of work, responsibilities and requirements that the petitioner ascribed to the proffered position and to the wage-level corresponding to such a level of work, responsibilities and requirements in accordance with the pertinent LCA regulations.

The statements regarding the claimed level of complexity, independent judgment and knowledge required for the proffered position, along with the petitioner's claimed requirements, are materially inconsistent with the certification of the LCA for a Level I entry-level position. This conflict undermines the overall credibility of the petition. The AAO finds that, fully considered in the context of the entire record of proceedings, the petitioner failed to establish the nature of the proffered position and in what capacity the beneficiary will actually be employed.

For the foregoing reasons, a review of the enclosed LCA indicates that the information provided does not correspond to the level of work and requirements that the petitioner ascribed to the proffered position and to the wage-level corresponding to such a level of work and requirements in accordance with the pertinent LCA regulations. As a result, even if it were determined that the petitioner overcame the other independent reason for the director's denial, the petition could still not be approved for this reason.

The AAO will now address the director's basis for denial of the petition, namely that the petitioner failed to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. Based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, and for the specific reasons described below, the AAO agrees with the director and finds that the evidence fails to establish that the position as described constitutes a specialty occupation.

When determining whether a position is a specialty occupation, the AAO must look at the nature of the business offering the employment and the description of the specific duties of the position as it relates to the particular employer. For an H-1B petition to be granted, the petitioner must provide sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the applicable 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 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 which [(2)] 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, a proposed 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 providing supplemental criteria that must be met in accordance with, and not as alternatives to, the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

As such and 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. See *Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007) (describing "a degree requirement in a specific specialty" as "one that relates directly to the duties and responsibilities of a particular 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 directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position, fairly represent the types of specialty occupations that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

To determine whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the AAO now turns to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). In the instant case, the petitioner has failed to establish nature of the proffered position and in what capacity the beneficiary will actually be employed. The petitioner's failure to establish the substantive nature of the work to be performed by the beneficiary precludes a finding that the proffered position satisfies any criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), because it is the substantive nature of that work that determines (1) the normal minimum educational requirement for the particular position, which is the focus of criterion 1; (2) industry positions which are parallel to the proffered position and thus appropriate for review for a common degree requirement, under the first alternate prong of criterion 2; (3) the level of complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position, which is the focus of the second alternate prong of criterion 2; (4) the factual justification for a petitioner normally requiring a degree or its equivalent, when that is an issue under criterion 3; and (5) the degree of specialization and complexity of the specific duties, which is the focus of criterion 4. Nevertheless, for the purpose of providing a comprehensive discussion, the AAO will now address in detail the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Assuming, *arguendo*, that the duties of the proffered position as described by the petitioner would in fact be the duties performed by the beneficiary, the AAO will continue its discussion regarding the duties and the evidence in the record of proceeding to determine whether the proffered position as described would qualify as a specialty occupation in relation to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1). This criterion requires that the petitioner establish that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position.

The petitioner stated that the beneficiary would be employed in an accountant position. However, to determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, USCIS does not simply

rely on a position's title. As previously mentioned, 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. *See generally 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 AAO recognizes the *Handbook* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.¹⁴ As previously discussed, the petitioner designated the proffered position in the LCA under the occupational category "Accountants and Auditors."

In the instant case, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not provided sufficient information to establish that the proffered position falls under the occupational category "Accountants and Auditors." Nevertheless, the AAO reviewed the chapter of the *Handbook* entitled "Accountants and Auditors" including the sections regarding the typical duties and requirements for this occupational category. However, the *Handbook* does not indicate that "Accountants and Auditors" comprise an occupational group for which at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the occupation.

When reviewing the *Handbook*, the AAO must note that the petitioner designated the proffered position as a Level I (entry) position in the LCA. This designation is indicative of a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupation and signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation. Furthermore, the petitioner's designation of the position under this wage level signifies that the beneficiary will be expected to work under close supervision and receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. Additionally, the beneficiary will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. Moreover, the beneficiary's work will be closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy. DOL guidance indicates that a job offer for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship is an indicator that a Level I wage should be considered.

The *Handbook* reports that certification may be advantageous or even required for some accountant positions. However, the AAO notes that there is no indication that the petitioner requires the beneficiary to have obtained the designation Certified Public Accountant (CPA), Certified Management Accountant (CMA) or any other professional designation to serve in the proffered position.

¹⁴ All of the AAO's references are to the 2012-2013 edition of the *Handbook*, which may be accessed at the Internet site <http://www.bls.gov/OCO/>. The AAO hereby incorporates into the record the excerpts from the *Handbook* regarding the duties and requirements for "Accountants and Auditors" and "Bookkeeping, Accounting, and Auditing Clerks."

While the *Handbook* states that most accountant positions require at least a bachelor's degree in accounting or a related field, the *Handbook* continues by stating the following:

In some cases, graduates of community colleges, as well as bookkeepers and accounting clerks who meet the education and experience requirements set by their employers, get junior accounting positions and advance to accountant positions by showing their accounting skills on the job.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2012-13 ed.*, Accountants and Auditors, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/oooh/Business-and-Financial/Accountants-and-auditors.htm#tab-4> (last visited November 27, 2013).

The *Handbook* does not support a finding that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the occupation. More specifically, the *Handbook* reports that some graduates from junior colleges or business or correspondence schools, as well as bookkeepers and accounting clerks meeting education and experience requirements set by employers, can advance to accountant positions by demonstrating their accounting skills. According to the *Handbook*, individuals who have less than a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, can obtain junior accounting positions and then advance to accountant positions. The *Handbook* does not state that this education and experience must be the equivalent to at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty.

The *Handbook* does not indicate that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty is normally the minimum requirement for entry into this occupation. Rather, the occupation accommodates a wide spectrum of educational credentials, including less than a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty. The *Handbook* states that most accountants and auditors need at least a bachelor's degree, however, this statement does not support the view that any accountant job qualifies as a specialty occupation as "most" is not indicative that a particular position within the wide spectrum of accountant jobs normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.¹⁵ More specifically, "most" is not indicative that a position normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, (the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I)), or that a 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

¹⁵ For instance, the first definition of "most" in *Webster's New College Dictionary* 731 (Third Edition, Hough Mifflin Harcourt 2008) is "[g]reatest in number, quantity, size, or degree." As such, if merely 51% of the positions require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, it could be said that "most" of the 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 (which as noted above is designated as a Level I entry position in the LCA). 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. To interpret this provision otherwise would run directly contrary to the plain language of the Act, which requires in part "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." Section 214(i)(1) of the Act.

criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4)). Therefore, even if the proffered position were determined to be an accountant position, the *Handbook* does not support the assertion that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the occupation.

The AAO also reviewed the section of the *Handbook* relating to "Bookkeeping, Accounting, and Auditing Clerks," and finds that the *Handbook* does not indicate that bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks comprise an occupational group for which normally the minimum requirement for entry is at least a bachelor's degree, in a specific specialty, or the equivalent. The *Handbook* provides the following information in the subsection entitled "How to Become a Bookkeeping, Accounting or Auditing Clerk" for this occupational category:

Most bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks need a high school diploma, and they usually learn some of their skills on the job. They must have basic math and computer skills, including knowledge of spreadsheets and bookkeeping software.

Education

Most bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks need a high school diploma. However, some employers prefer candidates who have some postsecondary education, particularly coursework in accounting. In 2009, 25 percent of these workers had an associate's or higher degree.

Training

Bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks usually get on-the-job training. Under the guidance of a supervisor or another experienced employee, new clerks learn how to do their tasks, including double-entry bookkeeping. (Double-entry bookkeeping means that each transaction is entered twice, once as a debit (cost) and once as a credit (income) to ensure that all accounts are balanced.)

Some formal classroom training also may be necessary, such as training in specialized computer software. This on-the-job training typically takes around 6 months.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2012-13 Edition*, Bookkeeping, Accounting, or Audit Clerks, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Office-and-Administrative-Support/Bookkeeping-accounting-and-auditing-clerks.htm#tab-4> (last visited November 27, 2013).

The *Handbook* does not report that, as an occupational group, "Bookkeeping, Accounting or Auditing Clerks" normally require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty for entry. The *Handbook* explains that most bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks need a high school diploma. The *Handbook* continues by stating that some employers prefer candidates who have some postsecondary education, particularly coursework in accounting (and that in 2009, about 25 percent of these workers had an associate's or higher degree). The *Handbook* further states that workers usually receive on-the-job training. The *Handbook* does not indicate that at least a

baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty (or its equivalent), is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the occupation.

In response to the RFE, counsel submitted a copy of the FLC Data Center, OWL printout for the occupational category "Accountants and Auditors." The AAO reviewed the printout in its entirety. However, it is insufficient to establish that the position qualifies as a specialty occupation for which normally the minimum requirement for entry is at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. A designation of Job Zone 4 -- Education and Training Code: 5 indicates that a position requires considerable preparation. It does not, however, demonstrate that a bachelor's degree in any specific specialty is required, and does not, therefore, demonstrate that a position so designated qualifies as a specialty occupation as defined in section 214(i)(1) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). More specifically, the OWL statement is a condensed version of what the O*NET actually states about its Job Zone 4 designation. See the O*NET OnLine Help Center, at <http://www.onetonline.org/help/online/zones> (explaining that Job Zone 4 signifies only that *most* but not all of the occupations within it require a bachelor's degree). Further, the Help Center's discussion confirms that Job Zone 4 does not indicate any requirements for particular majors or academic concentrations. *Id.* Therefore, the OWL and O*NET information is not probative of the proffered position qualifying as a specialty occupation. It is incumbent on the petitioner to provide sufficient evidence to establish that the particular position that it proffers would necessitate services at a level requiring the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's degree level of a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty.

In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that the proffered position falls under an occupational category for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, indicates that normally the minimum requirement for entry is at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Furthermore, the duties and requirements of the proffered position as described in the record of proceeding by the petitioner do not indicate that the position is one for which a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry. Thus, the petitioner failed to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

Next, the AAO will review the record regarding the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). This prong alternatively calls for a petitioner to establish that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, 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)).

Here and as already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, reports a standard industry-wide requirement of at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Thus, the AAO incorporates by reference its previous discussion on the matter. The record does not contain any letters from the industry's professional association, indicating that it has made a degree a minimum entry requirement.

In response to the director's RFE, counsel submitted copies of job advertisements in support of the assertion that the degree requirement is common to the petitioner's industry in parallel positions among similar organizations.¹⁶ However, upon review of the evidence, the AAO finds that counsel's reliance on the job announcements is misplaced.

That is, upon review of the documentation, the AAO notes that counsel did not provide any independent evidence of how representative the job advertisements are of the advertising employers' recruiting history for the type of jobs advertised. As the advertisements are only solicitations for hire, they are not evidence of the employers' actual hiring practices.

Furthermore, in the Form I-129, the petitioner stated that it is a retail company established in 1999. The petitioner also stated that it has five employees and a gross annual income of approximately \$4.8 million. Although requested on the Form I-129, the petitioner failed to provide its net annual income. The petitioner designated its business operations under the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 447110.¹⁷ The AAO notes that this NAICS code is designated for "Gasoline Stations with Convenience Stores." The U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau website describes this NAICS code by stating the following:

This industry comprises establishments engaged in retailing automotive fuels (e.g., diesel fuel, gasohol, gasoline) in combination with convenience store or food mart items. These establishments can either be in a convenience store (i.e., food mart) setting or a gasoline station setting. These establishments may also provide automotive repair services.

U.S. Dep't of Commerce, U.S Census Bureau, 2012 NAICS Definition, 447110 – Gasoline Stations with Convenience Stores, on the Internet at <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/sssd/naics/naicsrch#> (last visited November 27, 2013).

¹⁶ The AAO notes that counsel did not provide the entire job advertisement for the positions with several of the companies. That is, portions of the text are missing or have been cut-off. In addition, many of the job advertisements are illegible. Consequently, information regarding the requirements for these positions cannot be ascertained.

¹⁷ According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is used to classify business establishments according to type of economic activity and each establishment is classified to an industry according to the primary business activity taking place there. See <http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/> (last visited November 15, 2013).

For the petitioner to establish that an advertising organization is similar, it must demonstrate that the petitioner and the organization share the same general characteristics. Without such evidence, postings submitted by a petitioner are generally outside the scope of consideration for this criterion, which encompasses only organizations that are similar to the petitioner. When determining whether the petitioner and the advertising organization share the same general characteristics, such factors may include information regarding the nature or type of organization, and, when pertinent, the particular scope of operations, as well as the level of revenue and staffing (to list just a few elements that may be considered). It is not sufficient for the petitioner and counsel to claim that the organizations are similar and in the same industry without providing a legitimate basis for such an assertion. As previously mentioned, going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 165 (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190).

Upon review of the documentation, the AAO finds that the petitioner failed to establish that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, 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.

The job postings do not establish eligibility under this criterion of the regulations. For instance, the advertisements include positions with [REDACTED] (a wireless service company); [REDACTED] (a company in the wholesale trade/import-export industry); [REDACTED] (a company in the electronics, components, and semiconductor manufacturing industry); [REDACTED] (a company in the electronics, components, and semiconductor manufacturing industry); [REDACTED] (a company in the telecommunications services industry); [REDACTED] (a home improvement company); [REDACTED] (retailer of women's apparel); [REDACTED] (fashion industry); [REDACTED] (world's largest retailer of musical instruments); [REDACTED] (fashion industry); [REDACTED] (cosmetics); [REDACTED] (fashion industry). Without further information, the advertisements appear to be for organizations that are not similar to the petitioner and the petitioner has not provided any probative evidence to suggest otherwise. Further, many of the advertisement are for "confidential" employers, were placed by staffing agencies on behalf of the employers, or do not contain information other than the name and address of the advertising employers. Consequently, the record is devoid of sufficient information regarding the employers to conduct a legitimate comparison of the organization to the petitioner. The petitioner and counsel failed to supplement the record of proceeding to establish that the employers are similar to it. That is, the petitioner has not provided any information regarding which aspects or traits (if any) it shares with the organizations.

Moreover, some of the advertisements do not appear to be for parallel positions. For instance, counsel provided a posting for a senior financial analyst with [REDACTED] that requires a degree and five years of experience as a financial analyst. In addition, a posting for [REDACTED] for a senior financial analyst - community affairs requires a degree and 3 to 5 years of related work experience. A senior financial analyst position with [REDACTED] requires a degree and 5 to 7 years of experience. An advertisement placed by [REDACTED] for a senior financial analyst FP&A position requires a degree and 5 years of financial analysis/budgeting experience. As previously discussed, the petitioner designated the proffered position on the LCA through the wage

level as a Level I (entry level) position. The advertised positions appear to be for more senior positions than the proffered position. More importantly, the petitioner has not sufficiently established that the primary duties and responsibilities of the advertised positions are parallel to the proffered position.

Contrary to the purpose for which the advertisements were submitted, some of the postings do not establish that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required for the positions. For example, some of the postings state that a bachelor's degree is required, but they do not provide any further specification. Thus, they do not indicate that a bachelor's degree in a *specific specialty* that is directly related to the occupation is required. The AAO here reiterates that the degree requirement set by the statutory and regulatory framework of the H-1B program is not just a bachelor's or higher degree, but such a degree in a *specific specialty* that is directly related to the specialty occupation claimed in the petition. Moreover, the AAO observes that counsel submitted advertisements indicating that a bachelor's degree in business is acceptable. As previously mentioned, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a degree in business administration, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d at 147. Further, counsel submitted postings that do not specify the level of education required (e.g., associate's degree, vocational degree/diploma, baccalaureate, master's degree). The advertisements do not indicate that the employer requires at least a baccalaureate level of education.

As the documentation does not establish that the petitioner has met this prong of the regulations, further analysis regarding the specific information contained in each of the job postings is not necessary. That is, not every deficit of every job posting has been addressed. The evidence does not establish that similar organizations in the same industry routinely require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for parallel positions.¹⁸

¹⁸ 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 these advertisements with regard to determining the common educational requirements for entry into parallel positions in similar 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 companies that are similar to the petitioner requires a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, it cannot be found that these postings, which appear to have been consciously selected could credibly refute the 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.

Thus, based upon a complete review of the record, the petitioner has not established that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, 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. 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 AAO will next consider the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), which is satisfied if the petitioner shows that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

Counsel states in response to the RFE that the petitioner's "goal is to turn [its operations] into a leading retailer and premier fuel supplier." In response to the RFE, the petitioner indicates that it is intending to diversify and "seeking new opportunities to establish an internet business." The petitioner further indicates that it is poised to increase its "retail presence" and "generate more value out of the real estate business." Although the petitioner claims that it has plans to expand its business operations, it did not provide probative documentation to support the claim (e.g., a business plan; documentation substantiating the expansion of physical facilities; plans to hire staff; evidence substantiating that the petitioner intends to establish branch, subsidiary or affiliate offices; probative evidence substantiating investments or new revenue sources; or other documentation regarding development/expansion plans).¹⁹

In support of its assertion that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the petitioner submitted various documents, including evidence regarding its business operations. For example, the petitioner submitted corporate documents, its business licenses, tax documents, bank account statements, and related documentation. The AAO reviewed the record of proceeding in its entirety. However, upon review of the record, the AAO finds that the petitioner failed to sufficiently develop relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position.

That is, a review of the record of proceeding indicates that the petitioner has failed to credibly demonstrate the duties the beneficiary will be responsible for or perform on a day-to-day basis constitute a position so complex or unique that it can only be performed by a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.²⁰ Furthermore, the petitioner has not established why a few related courses or industry experience alone is insufficient preparation for the proffered position. Additionally, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not provided sufficient documentation to support a claim that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can only

¹⁹ Claims that the petitioner intends to expand its business operations in the future is insufficient to demonstrate that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. That is, a petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1). 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'r 1978).

²⁰ Moreover, the petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that the beneficiary has been performing, and will continue to perform, the duties as described by the petitioner.

be performed by an individual with a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. This is further evidenced by the LCA submitted by the petitioner in support of the instant petition.

More specifically, the LCA indicates a wage level at a Level I (entry level) wage. As previously mentioned, the wage-level of the proffered position indicates that the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation; that he will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. Without further evidence, it is simply not credible that the petitioner's proffered position is complex or unique as such a position would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a significantly higher prevailing wage. For example, a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems."²¹

The petitioner fails to demonstrate how the duties of the position as described require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge such that a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform them. For instance, the petitioner did not submit information relevant to a detailed course of study leading to a specialty degree and did not establish how such a curriculum is necessary to perform the duties it may believe are so complex and unique. While a few related courses may be beneficial, or even required, in performing certain duties of the position, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate how an established curriculum of such courses leading to a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform the duties of the proffered position. The description of the duties does not specifically identify any tasks that are so complex or unique that only a specifically degreed individual could perform them. The record lacks sufficiently detailed information to distinguish the proffered position as more complex or unique from other positions that can be performed by persons without at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The AAO observes that the petitioner has indicated that the beneficiary's background and his prior experience working for the petitioner will assist him in carrying out the duties of the proffered position. However, the test to establish a position as a specialty occupation is not the skill set or education of a proposed beneficiary, but whether the position itself requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge obtained by at least baccalaureate-level knowledge in a specialized area. In the instant case, the petitioner does not establish which of the duties, if any, of the proffered position would be so complex or unique as to be distinguishable from those of similar but non-degreed or non-specialty degreed employment. The petitioner fails to demonstrate that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Consequently, it

²¹ For additional information regarding wage levels as defined by DOL, see U.S. Dep't of Labor, Emp't & Training Admin., *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagric. Immigration Programs (rev. Nov. 2009), available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf

cannot be concluded that the petitioner has satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) entails an employer demonstrating that it normally requires a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the position. To this end, the AAO usually reviews the petitioner's past recruiting and hiring practices, as well as information regarding employees who previously held the position.

To merit approval of the petition under this criterion, the record must establish that a petitioner's imposition of a degree requirement is not merely a matter of preference for high-caliber candidates but is necessitated by performance requirements of the position. Upon review of the record of proceeding, the petitioner has not established a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proffered position only persons with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

While a petitioner may believe or otherwise assert that a proffered position requires a specific 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 occupation as long as the petitioner 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 388. In other words, if a petitioner's stated degree requirement is only designed to artificially meet the standards for an H-1B visa and/or to underemploy an individual in a position for which he or she is overqualified and if 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").

To satisfy this criterion, the evidence of record must show that the specific performance requirements of the position generated the recruiting and hiring history. A petitioner's perfunctory declaration of a particular educational requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. USCIS must examine the actual employment requirements, and, on the basis of that examination, determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384. In this pursuit, the critical element is not the title of the position, or the fact that an employer has routinely insisted on certain educational standards, but whether performance of 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. To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if USCIS were constrained to recognize a specialty occupation merely because the petitioner has an established practice of demanding certain educational requirements for the proffered position - and without consideration of how a beneficiary is to be specifically employed - then any alien with a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty could be brought into the United States to perform non-specialty occupations, so long as the employer required all such employees to have baccalaureate or higher degrees. *See id.* at 388.

In response to the director's RFE, the counsel submitted copies of advertisements that counsel states represent the "[p]etitioner's recruitment efforts to fill [the] Accountant position." Notably, the two advertisements provided indicate that a bachelor's degree in business administration is acceptable preparation for the proffered position. As previously discussed, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a degree in business administration, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. See *Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d at 147.

Further, the advertisements are only solicitations for hire, they are not evidence of the petitioner's actual hiring practices. The AAO observes that neither advertisement bears either a "post date" or a "creation date," nor does either bear a "closing date" or an "expiration date." Further, neither printout bears a date indicating when the petitioner printed the positing. Thus, it is not apparent from the documentation provided that the position was actually advertised.

In response to the RFE, counsel states that prior to hiring the beneficiary, "independent contractors have provided these services to [the petitioner]." Counsel further claims that "[t]hose individuals had education and experience equivalent to a U.S. Bachelor's degree in Business Administration, Accounting, or a related degree." However, neither counsel nor the petitioner provided any evidence in support of this statement. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The petitioner stated in the Form I-129 petition that it was established in 1999 (approximately thirteen years prior to the filing of the H-1B petition). Notably, the petitioner did not specify the total number of individuals that have performed the duties now associated with the proffered position and how many of them had a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Further, the petitioner failed to provide documentation to substantiate counsel's assertion that the independent contractors that previously performed the duties of the position held bachelor's degrees in a specific specialty (or the equivalent).

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that it normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the proffered position. Thus, the petitioner has not 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 the specific 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 in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The AAO acknowledges that the petitioner and counsel may believe that the nature of the specific

duties of the position in the context of its business operations is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. As previously discussed, the petitioner and counsel claim that the petitioner plans to expand and develop its business operations. However, the petitioner failed to provide probative evidence to substantiate this claim. Moreover, even in light of the claimed plans for expansion/development, the petitioner and counsel did not establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

That is, the AAO reviewed all of the evidence in the record of proceeding, including the job description and the evidence regarding the petitioner's business operations, such as copies of business licenses and tax documents, bank account statements, and other documentation. The AAO finds that the petitioner's statements and the submitted documentation fail to support the assertion that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under this criterion of the regulations. In the instant case, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position.

The AAO also reiterates its earlier comments and findings with regard to the implication of the petitioner's designation of the proffered position in the LCA as a Level I (the lowest of four assignable levels). That is, the Level I wage designation is indicative of a low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupational category, and hence one not likely distinguishable by relatively specialized and complex duties. As noted earlier, DOL indicates that a Level I designation is appropriate for "beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation." Without further evidence, it is simply not credible that the petitioner's proffered position is one with specialized and complex duties as such a position would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a significantly higher prevailing wage. For instance, as previously mentioned, a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems."

The petitioner has submitted inadequate probative evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. Thus, the petitioner has not established that the duties of the position are so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. The AAO, therefore, concludes that the petitioner failed to satisfy the criterion 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 it has satisfied any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) and, therefore, it cannot be found that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied for this reason.

The AAO does not need to examine the issue of the beneficiary's qualifications, because the petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proffered 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.

The AAO observes that the instant petition seeks to extend the beneficiary's H-1B employment with the petitioner, and notes that it 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).

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 145 (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).²²

Moreover, when the AAO denies a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge only if it shows that the AAO abused its discretion with respect to all of the AAO's enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1043, *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683.

The petition will be 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, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

²² The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 145. However, as the petitioner has failed to establish eligibility for the benefit sought and the appeal is dismissed, the AAO will not further discuss the additional issues and deficiencies it observes in the record of proceeding. That is, as the grounds discussed above are dispositive of the petitioner's eligibility for the benefit sought in this matter, the AAO will not address and will instead reserve its determination on the additional issues that it observes in the record of proceeding with regard to the H-1B petition.