



DA

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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



File: LIN-01-185-54673

Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: NOV - 7 2002

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 that 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 that 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 that 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 a hotel with 15 employees and a gross annual income of \$1,200,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a hotel 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 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 petitioner had not established that a baccalaureate degree or higher is required for the proffered position, that it normally requires such a degree, or that the proposed duties are so complex as to require such a degree. On appeal, counsel submits the petitioner's job advertisement to demonstrate that it normally requires a bachelor's degree or an equivalent thereof for the position of hotel manager. Counsel also submits several letters from individuals involved in the hotel industry to support his claim.

Counsel's additional information 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:

The manager's duties include overseeing the front office staff and their supervisors to working with the sales department to ensure a high occupancy percentage for the hotel and housekeeping department. The manager's responsibilities 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 (ADR), ensuring a high hotel profit, administering of the rates of the hotels preferred accounts and a count of business received from them, inventory control, handling guest complaints and taking appropriate action to ensure such complaints do not occur. All in all, the Hotel Manager is to see that all departments within the hotel maintains [sic] the highest standards in the industry to ensure total guest satisfaction and a high occupancy percentage and ADR.

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 business administration or hospitality management. In its Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2002-2003 edition, at pages 71-72, the Department of Labor finds no requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area for employment as a hotel manager. Community colleges, junior colleges, and some universities offer associate, bachelor's, and graduate degree programs in hotel or 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, although the petitioner's past hiring practices indicate that it normally requires a baccalaureate degree in hotel management or an equivalent thereof 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 hotel management or an equivalent thereof for its hotel 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, although the record contains letters from two individuals involved in the hotel industry who state that the usual requirement for positions such as the proffered position is a baccalaureate degree in hospitality management or a related position, two letters are insufficient evidence of an industry standard. The writers have not provided evidence in support of their assertions, nor have they

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

indicated the number or percentage of hotel managers who hold such degrees. The letters from the industry experts also have been reviewed. It is noted, however, that none of the industry experts actually state that a baccalaureate degree is a requirement. 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 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.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.