

D2

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

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



File: EAC-01-276-53970 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: MAR 19 2003

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)

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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 Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a restaurant, pastry, and catering business with four employees and a gross annual income of \$200,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a restaurant 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.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), the term "specialty occupation" is defined 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 demonstrated that the proffered position requires a baccalaureate degree. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the record contains evidence that an H-1B petition had been approved previously for the petitioner for the same position.

Counsel's statement on appeal is not persuasive. The Bureau 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 Bureau considers. In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

Oversee service in the dining room and other areas of the operations. Supervise shift of workers, select menu items, analyze the recipes of the dishes to determine food labor, overhead costs and assign prices to various dishes. Place orders with suppliers and schedule delivery of fresh food and beverages. Interview, hire, and fire employees, resolve customers' complaints. Tally the cash and charge receipts received and balance them against the record of sales. Additionally, she will plan menu not only for the general public and especially for events

that are catered upon particular request. She will take into consideration the amount of time to be served for those dishes, the cost of labor and ascertain cost of expenses in order to determine prices for the menu items as well those orders for catered advanced. [sic] It is also necessary to arrange for orders and deliveries of merchandise and general inventory control to see to it that adequate supplies will meet customers' needs.

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 Bureau does not agree with counsel's argument that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in hotel and restaurant management or a related field. The proffered position is that of a food service manager. A review of the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2002-2003 edition, at pages 56-57, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty for employment as a food service manager. Most food service management companies and national or regional restaurant chains recruit management trainees from 2 and 4-year college hospitality management programs. In addition, some restaurant and food service manager positions, particularly self-service and fast food, are filled by promoting experienced food and beverage preparation and service workers. 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, counsel asserts that the Bureau has already determined that the proffered position is a specialty occupation since the Bureau had approved another, similar petition in the past. This record of proceeding does not, however, contain any of the supporting evidence submitted to the Vermont Service Center in the prior case. In the absence of all of the corroborating evidence contained in that record of proceeding, the AAO cannot determine whether the original H-1B petition was approved in error.

Each nonimmigrant petition is a separate proceeding with a separate record. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(d). In making a determination of statutory eligibility, the Bureau is limited to the information contained in the record of proceeding. See 8 C.F.R.

§ 103.2(b)(16)(ii). Although the AAO may attempt to hypothesize as to whether the prior approval was granted in error, no such determination may be made without review of the original record in its entirety. If the prior petition was approved based on evidence that was substantially similar to the evidence contained in this record of proceeding that is now before the AAO, however, the approval of that petition would have been erroneous. The Service is not required to approve petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals which may have been erroneous. See, e.g., *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I. & N. Dec. 593, 597 (Comm. 1988). Neither the Bureau nor any other agency must treat acknowledged errors as binding precedent. *Sussex Engg. Ltd. v. Montgomery*, 825 F.2d 1084, 1090 (6th Cir. 1987), cert denied, 485 U.S. 1008 (1988).

Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is common to the industry in parallel positions among organizations similar to the petitioner. 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.

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.