

D2

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

**Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE  
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F  
425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: EAC-01-236-52046

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: OCT 17 2003

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)

ON 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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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. A subsequent appeal was rejected by the director as untimely filed, and accepted as a motion to reopen and reconsider. The director affirmed his previous decision to deny the petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an Indian specialty restaurant with five employees and a gross annual income of \$1 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a food and beverage director 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.

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 had not demonstrated that a baccalaureate degree is required for the proffered position. On appeal, counsel submits an expanded description of the duties the petitioner anticipates the beneficiary would perform as a food and beverage director. Counsel further provides letters from the human resource directors of various hotels to demonstrate that the degree requirement is industry wide.

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

- Oversee and direct management of all operational aspects of the restaurant business including but not limited to: personnel, quality control, food & beverages, purchasing, marketing and finance;
- Review and analyze current performance, identify structures and operational problems and suggest, develop and implement revenue and performance optimizing systems and policies;
- Interface with ownership; participate in executive level meetings. Develop and direct day-to-day policies. Develop, review, analyze and implement budgetary goals; [and]
- Allocates [sic] funds, authorizes [sic] expenditures, and assists [sic] in planning budgets for departments.

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 AAO does not agree with counsel's assertion that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor of business administration degree in management or a related field. The proffered 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, the petitioner has not demonstrated that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specific specialty such as business administration in management, for the offered position. Third, the petitioner did not present any persuasive 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. The three letters from individuals employed in the restaurant industry, who state that a food and beverage manager requires the minimum of a baccalaureate degree in business administration (management), are noted. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence, however, is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). 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.

Counsel's citation of *Matter of Sun*, Int. Dec. 1816 (D.D. 1966), is also noted. This decision, however, dealt with membership in the professions, not membership in a specialty occupation. While these terms are similar, they are not synonymous. The term "specialty occupation" is specifically defined in section 214(i) of the Act. That statutory language effectively supersedes *Sun*.

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.