



D2

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: EAC-01-138-50276 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: JAN 23 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



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

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director. A subsequent appeal was accepted as a motion to reopen, and the director affirmed his decision to deny the petition. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an international travel agency with three employees and a gross annual income of \$2.5 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a travel executive for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation or that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits additional information, including a statement from the petitioner's chief executive officer.

8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(ii) defines the term "specialty occupation" as:

an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

The director denied the petition because the duties described by the petitioner did not appear to be so complex as to require a baccalaureate degree. The director further found that the petitioner had not demonstrated that the beneficiary's educational and employment backgrounds qualified him to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. On appeal, the petitioner's chief executive officer states, in part, that the petitioner is not a travel agency in the general sense, as it is the sole representative in North America of the National Air Line of the Republic of Sri Lanka. He further states that most of the functions the petitioner performs for such airline are included in the MBA course in international aviation. He additionally states that the evaluator who determined that the beneficiary's work experience and qualifications equate to a U.S. baccalaureate degree in business administration has had many of her evaluations accepted by the Service.

The petitioner's statement on appeal is not persuasive. The Service does not use a title, by itself, when determining whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation. The specific

duties of the offered position combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations are factors that the Service considers. In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

Planning, Managing & Developing International Travel plans & Packages

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must meet one of the following criteria:

1. A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
2. The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
3. The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
4. The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

The petitioner has not met any of the above requirements to classify the offered position as a specialty occupation.

First, the Service does not agree with the petitioner's argument that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in business administration or a related field. The proffered position appears to be that of a travel agent. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2002-2003 edition, at page 377, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty for employment as a travel agent. The minimum requirement is a high school diploma or its equivalent for entry into travel agent positions. As technology and computerization are having a profound effect on the work of travel agents, some form of specialized training, such as that offered in many vocational schools, adult public education programs, and in community and 4-year colleges, is becoming increasingly important. In addition, certain personal qualities and participation in in-house training programs are often considered as significant as the beneficiary's specific educational background. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Second, the petitioner has not shown that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specific specialty for the offered position. Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that businesses similar to the petitioner in their type of operations, number of employees, and amount of gross annual income, require the services of individuals in parallel positions. Finally, the petitioner did not demonstrate that the nature of the beneficiary's proposed duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

As the petitioner has not sufficiently established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation, the beneficiary's qualifications need not be examined further in this proceeding.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.