



D2

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identification data deleted in
order to clearly warrant
protection of personal privacy

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



File: LIN-00-123-50180 Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: 24 APR 2007

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)

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 denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an upscale, full-service restaurant with 40 employees and an approximate gross annual income of \$980,000. It seeks to extend its authorization to employ the beneficiary as a food and beverage service manager 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 is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

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.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to establish that the restaurant industry normally required a baccalaureate degree for positions similar to the proffered one. The director further found that the evaluation of the beneficiary's educational background was not performed by an official who had authority to grant college-level credit in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the petitioner's expert opinions were evaluated improperly and dismissed unfairly. Counsel also states that university professor who evaluated the beneficiary's educational and employment background is authorized to grant college-level credits.

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 does not hold a baccalaureate degree in any field of study. The beneficiary holds a vocational certificate in hotel and catering management conferred by a French institution. The record indicates that the beneficiary also had eight years of relevant employment experience at the time of the filing of the initial petition. The record contains two evaluations indicating that the beneficiary's foreign education and employment experience are equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree in management with an emphasis in hospitality 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).

One of the evaluations was completed by an education consulting firm. The other evaluation was completed by an academic expert from an accredited university. The petitioner, however, has not persuasively demonstrated that the either evaluation was performed by an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit

based on an individual's training and/or work experience, as required by 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1).

Counsel argues that the evaluation from the university professor should be accepted by the Service. Although the record does contain evidence that the university is accredited, information in the record indicates that the university's office of admissions makes the determination whether credits may be awarded for work completed at institutions outside of the United States after receiving an evaluation of the beneficiary's transcripts from an evaluating agency recognized by the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs. No where in the record, other than the statement by counsel, is there any evidence that the professor who completed the evaluation has credit granting authority. It was held in Matter of Obaigbena, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988) and Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez, 17 I&N Dec. (BIA 1980) that the assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. It is also noted that the record contains no copy of the beneficiary's college transcripts nor does it appear that either of the two evaluators reviewed the beneficiary's college transcripts as part of their evaluations. In view of the foregoing, the evaluations are 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 him 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.

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. The petitioner describes the duties of the offered position as follows:

. . . train, hire and assign workers; administer inventory and budget expenditures by utilizing sophisticated computerized systems; develop menus and adapt French and Italian recipes to local ingredients; present and purchase wines and beverages to compliment the Mediterranean presentation of all food items; and investigate and resolve food quality and service complaints in a highly professional and skilled manner.

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 the petitioner's argument that the beneficiary's proffered position as a food and beverage service manager would normally require a bachelor's degree in management with an emphasis on hospitality management or a related field. The proffered position appears to be that of a restaurant or food service manager. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2002-2003 edition, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area for employment as a restaurant or food service manager. Some restaurant and food service managers are promoted from the ranks of restaurant workers. Others hold baccalaureate and associate (two-year) degrees in restaurant management and other fields of study. 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, although the petitioner claims that it normally requires a baccalaureate degree in management with an emphasis on hospitality management or a related field, for the proffered position, the

petitioner's reasoning is problematic when viewed in light of the statutory definition of specialty occupation. The petitioner's creation of a position with a perfunctory bachelor's degree requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. As with employment agencies as petitioners, the Service must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. Cf. Defensor v. Meissner, 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). The critical element is not the title of the position or an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a bachelor's degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.¹ To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if the Service was limited to reviewing a petitioner's self-imposed employment requirements, then any alien with a bachelor's degree could be brought into the United States to perform a menial, non-professional, or an otherwise non-specialty occupation, so long as the employer required all such employees to have bachelor's degrees. See id. at 388.

In this case, although the petitioner claimed to have hired only individuals with a bachelor's degree in management with an emphasis on hospitality management or a related field, for its food and beverage service manager positions, the position, nevertheless, does not meet the statutory definition of specialty occupation. The position, itself, does not require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Therefore, even though the petitioner has required a bachelor's degree in the past, the position still does not require a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty.

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 record does 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

¹ The court in Defensor v. Meissner observed that the four criteria at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) present certain ambiguities when compared to the statutory definition, and "might also be read as merely an additional requirement that a position must meet, in addition to the statutory and regulatory definition." Supra at 387.

is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

The record contains various letters from individuals involved in the restaurant industry who state that a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area is required for positions such as the proffered position. Such 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 has indicated the number or percentage of restaurant managers who hold such degrees. It is also noted that the letter from the executive director of the [REDACTED] does not indicate that such degree is required. Neither counsel nor the petitioner presents evidence that any restaurant association has attested that a baccalaureate or higher degree is a minimum entry requirement for this occupation.

With respect to counsel's objection to denial of this petition in view of the approval of a similar petition in the past, the Associate Commissioner, through the Administrative Appeals Office, is not bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D.La. 2000), aff'd, 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), cert. denied, 122 S. Ct.51 (U.S. 2001).

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.