



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying information 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-99-054-52097 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: DEC 21 2001

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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which 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 which 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 which 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 approved by the Director, Vermont Service Center. Based upon information obtained from the beneficiary during his visa issuance process at the American Embassy, the director determined that the beneficiary was not clearly eligible for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director properly served the petitioner with notice of his intent to revoke approval of the visa petition and his reasons therefore, and ultimately revoked the approval of the petition. The director granted a subsequent motion to reconsider and affirmed his previous decision. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a hotel business with eight employees and a gross annual income of \$512,627. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a manager for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a statement.

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 revoked the petition because the duties described by the petitioner did not appear to be so complex as to require a baccalaureate degree. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the reasons for the revocation were not clear and that the Service's decision was improper.

Counsel'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:

We have a need of a manager to manage the entire operation. This will involve supervising the entire

staff, including desk clerks, housekeepers and maintenance staff, handling all problems of guests, handling all registration details and special requests and finally but not limited to being responsible for the successful operation of this facility.

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 counsel's argument that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in commerce or a related field. In its Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2000-2001 edition, at pages 55-57, the Department of Labor finds no requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area for employment as a hotel manager. Community and junior colleges, and some universities offer associate, bachelor's, and graduate degree programs in hotel and restaurant management. In addition, technical schools, vocational and trade schools, and other academic institutions offer programs leading to formal recognition in hotel or restaurant management. Although postsecondary education is preferred, some hotel employees still advance to hotel management positions without education beyond high school. 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 specialized area such as commerce, for the offered position. Third, although the record contains three letters from individuals involved in the hotel industry who state that the usual

requirement for positions such as the proffered position is a baccalaureate degree in commerce or an equivalent, three letters are insufficient evidence of an industry standard. The writers have not provided evidence in support of their assertions. In addition, none of the writers have indicated the number or percentage of hotel managers who hold such degrees. 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.

With respect to the assertion by the petitioner's president that the Service approved a similar petition in the past, this Service is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated. The record of proceeding, as presently constituted, does not contain a copy of the previously approved petition and its supporting documentation. It is, therefore, not possible to determine definitively whether it was approved in error or whether the facts and conditions have changed since its approval.

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.