



D2

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Public Copy

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



File: WAC 98 146 50383

Office: California Service Center

Date: OCT 01 2001


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)

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Associate Commissioner for Examinations. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner on a motion to reopen and reconsider. The motion will be granted and the previous decisions of the director and the Associate Commissioner will be affirmed.

The petitioner is a bake shop and restaurant with three employees and asserted gross annual income of \$190,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a specialty chef for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the offered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel argued that the offered position is a specialty occupation and the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

On motion, counsel argues the Administrative Appeals Office erred when it misinterpreted the ruling of the court in the ruling in Hong Kong T.V. Video Program, Inc. V. Ilchert, 685 F. Supp. 712. Counsel states that the Administrative Appeals Office should also have followed the guidance of the Department of Labor's Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) which assigns a Specific Vocational Preparation rating of 8 to a pastry chef. Counsel argues that the Administrative Appeals Office should have given weight to the DOT designation.

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)(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 a baccalaureate degree in industrial education with an emphasis on teaching home economics. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has shown that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of the offered position.

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 to fully perform the occupation in such 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 offered position are described in pertinent part as follows:

Responsible for producing Philippine meals, baked bread, cakes, pastries and other Philippine delicacies ... Responsible for directing and supervising the work of food service managerial staff and other kitchen workers in estimating food requirements and ordering food supplies locally and from abroad ... Plan, develop a wide range of specialty Filipino menu and specialty delicacies for use in petitioner's existing restaurant business and bake shop and to be used for future expansion of petitioner's businesses ...

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 offered position. In addition, the petitioner has not shown that similar firms require the services of such individuals in parallel positions.

Counsel again asserts that the proposed position is considered a specialty occupation in view of the court ruling in Hong Kong T.V. Video Program, Inc. v. Ilchert, 685 F. Supp. 712 (N.D. Cal. 1988) (Hong Kong), which found a company president position professional based on the complexity of its duties alone even though a degree is not required. While the Service does not consider itself bound by this decision outside the Northern District of California, this proceeding is within that jurisdiction. Even so, Hong Kong is inapplicable here because it dealt narrowly with a company president with both extensive experience and significant authority over individuals.

In the court case, the beneficiary was the president of the largest Asian-language video distribution company in the United States, which under the beneficiary's guidance had achieved a gross annual

income of approximately \$10 million within seven years of the company's founding. In addition, he had direct oversight over 70 employees and over 700 sublicensees, and his salary was \$140,000 per year. He was a corporate executive who made decisions at the senior management level of an extensive business operation. He was responsible for corporate strategy, budgeting, financial planning, marketing and promotional strategy, transportation and distribution of goods, product and inventory control, contractual negotiation and determination, and legal involvement with "pirate" firms involved in illegally duplicating and selling the company's products.

Unlike here, the beneficiary supervised managers who, in turn, had supervisors and assistants reporting to them. The supervisors and assistants, in turn, had employees such as foremen, blue-collar workers, secretaries, receptionists, clerks, and sales assistants reporting to them. The beneficiary is not a company president. The petitioner has not demonstrated that her proposed duties are as complex as those of the beneficiary in Hong Kong.

Counsel again asserts that the Department of Labor has determined that the offered position is a specialty occupation. However, a reference in the Department of Labor's Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT), Fourth Edition, 1977, standing alone, is not enough to establish an occupation is a specialty occupation. The DOT classification system and its categorization of an occupation as "professional and kindred" are not directly related to membership in a profession or specialty occupation as defined in immigration law. In the DOT listing of occupations, any given subject area within the professions contains nonprofessional work, as well as work within the professions.

The latest edition of the DOT does not give information about the educational and other requirements for the different occupations. This type of information is currently furnished by the Department of Labor in the various editions of the Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook). The latter publication is given considerable weight (certainly much more than the DOT) in determining whether an occupation is within the professions. This is because it provides specific and detailed information regarding the educational and other requirements for occupations.

The Handbook, 1998-1999 edition, at page 312 finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area for employment as a chef. Some chefs learn their trade through on-the-job training or apprenticeship. Others attend vocational school or a two-year college. Still others earn baccalaureate degrees at colleges, universities, or culinary institutes. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of regulations.

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 decisions of the director and the Associate Commissioner will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The order of May 22, 2000 dismissing the appeal is affirmed.