



02

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

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



Public Copy

File: LIN 00 058 52932 Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: JUL - 6 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:



Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a hotel which seeks to employ the beneficiary as a front desk 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 argues that the proffered position is a specialty occupation and the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

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), provides in part for nonimmigrant classification to qualified aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(1), defines a "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and 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.

Pursuant to section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(B), the petitioner shall submit the following with an H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation:

1. A certification from the Secretary of Labor that the petitioner has filed a labor condition application with the Secretary,
2. A statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application for the duration of the alien's authorized period of stay, and
3. Evidence that the alien qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation.

The petitioner has provided a certified labor condition application and a statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, the alien must meet one of the following criteria:

1. Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
2. Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
3. Hold an unrestricted State license, registration, or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
4. Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

The beneficiary's foreign education has been found by a credentials evaluation service to be equivalent to an associate (two-year) degree in economics conferred by a United States institution. This evaluation appears reasonable and will be accepted. The same evaluation service found the beneficiary's education plus employment experience to be equivalent to a baccalaureate degree in hotel management.

This Service uses an independent evaluation of a person's foreign credentials in terms of education in the United States as an advisory opinion only. Where an evaluation is not in accord with previous equivalencies or is in any way questionable, it may be rejected or given less weight. See Matter of SEA, Inc., 19 I&N Dec. 817 (Comm. 1988).

Here, the evaluation of the beneficiary's foreign credentials is based on education and experience. The evaluator has not demonstrated specifically how the evaluation was made nor the basis for making it (including copies of the relevant portions of any research materials used). In addition, neither the petitioner nor the evaluator has established that the beneficiary's employment

experience was experience in a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the evaluation is accorded little weight.

The beneficiary is not a member of any organizations whose usual prerequisite for entry is a baccalaureate degree in a specialized field of study. The record contains no evidence that the beneficiary holds a state license, registration, or certification which authorizes her to practice a specialty occupation. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation.

The term "specialty occupation" is defined at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(ii) 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.

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 duties of the proffered position are described in pertinent part as follows:

Overseeing the front office staff and their supervisors to working with the sales department Other major functions include hiring, training, and evaluating employees; financial planning within the budget allocation of the corporate office; meeting the yearly budget for occupancy percentage as well as average daily rate ...; ensuring a high house profit

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. 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 for the proffered position. In addition, the petitioner has not shown that similar firms require the services of such individuals in parallel positions. The petitioner's stated minimum requirement is a baccalaureate degree, not a bachelor's degree in a specialized and related area.

Counsel has provided a newspaper advertisement for a similar position in support of his assertion that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. However, that advertisement requires either a baccalaureate degree in either business management or hotel management or two years of experience.

A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2000-2001 edition, at page 56-57 finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area for employment as a hotel manager. Some hotel managers are still promoted from the ranks of hotel workers. Most employers prefer a baccalaureate or associate degree in hotel management or in other fields of study. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the proffered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

With respect to counsel's objection to denial of this petition in view of the approval of similar petitions in the past, this Service is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated. Matter of M--, 4 I&N Dec. 532 (A.G. 1952; BIA 1952). See also Pearson v. Williams, 202 U.S. 281 (1906); Mannerfrid v. Brownell, 145 F. Supp. 55 (D.D.C. 1956), affirmed 238 F.2d 32 (D.C. Cir. 1956); Lazarescu v. United States, 199 F.2d 898 (4th Cir. 1952); and U.S. ex rel. Vajta v. Watkins, 179 F.2d 137 (2nd Cir. 1950). The record of proceeding, as presently constituted, does not contain copies of the approved visa petitions and their supporting documents. It is, therefore, not possible to determine definitively whether they were approved in error or whether the facts and conditions have changed since their 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. Accordingly, the decision of the director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.