



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the  
Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 8419276

DATE: JULY 2, 2020

Appeal of California Service Center Decision

Form I-129, Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker

The Petitioner, a designer and developer of advanced power electronics products for electrical energy conversion and control, seeks to temporarily employ the Beneficiary under the H-1B nonimmigrant classification for specialty occupations. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). The H-1B program allows a U.S. employer to temporarily employ a qualified foreign worker in a position that requires both (a) the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge and (b) the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum prerequisite for entry into the position.

The Director of the California Service Center denied the petition, concluding that the record did not establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. In these proceedings, it is the Petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the requested benefit. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Upon *de novo* review, we will sustain the appeal.

Based upon our review of the entire record of proceedings, including the submissions on appeal addressing the grounds for the Director's decision, we determine that the Petitioner has overcome the basis of the Director's denial. The Petitioner has provided a detailed job description for the proffered position and explained why these duties, when performed within the context of its specific business operation, are specialized and complex. Specifically, we conclude 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, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4). Further, we conclude that Petitioner has established, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the particular position being offered to the Beneficiary qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation as the term is defined at section 214(i)(1) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained.