



Da

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: EAC-00-069-50727 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: OCT 11 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 and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an Italian restaurant with 13 employees and a gross annual income of \$450,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a lead chef 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 qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

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 professional in nature. The director also found that the beneficiary's education and work experience did not warrant the issuance of an H-1B visa for the position of executive chef. On appeal, counsel states in part that the proffered position is so complex as to require an H-1B visa. Counsel further states that the beneficiary possesses specialized knowledge.

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:

- (1) Plans menus such as pasta fagoli, focaccia, zuppa di pesce, pollo romano, scampi and linguina vongole by reviewing and analyzing recipes taking into account the popularity of various dishes, and the recent serving of particular dishes;

- (2) Estimates food consumption in order to determine purchases required for the kitchen and ensuring that materials are bought within the specified budget;
- (3) Supervises cooking and other kitchen personnel and coordinates the kitchen staffs' assignment to ensure the most efficiency in the production of all food items; and
- (4) Hires and discharges the employees in the kitchen.

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 position of lead chef would normally require a bachelor's degree in the culinary arts or a related field. The proffered position appears to be that of a chef. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook), 2000-2001 edition, at pages 336-337 finds no requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area for employment as a chef. Some chefs learn their trade through on-the-job training or through apprenticeship. Others hold certificates, associate degrees, and baccalaureate degrees from senior colleges and universities, junior and community colleges, or culinary institutes. 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 culinary arts, 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 expert opinion included in the record is noted. The writer asserts that the Department of Labor has determined that the proffered 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 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. It is also noted that one opinion is insufficient evidence of an industry standard. The writer has not provided evidence in support of his assertions. In addition, the writer has not indicated the number or percentage of chefs who hold such degrees.

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.

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.