

invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



PUBLIC COPY **DA** FEB 08 2005

FILE: EAC 03 156 51841 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date:

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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a restaurant that seeks to employ the beneficiary as its food and beverage manager. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to § 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition because the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional evidence, including opinion letters from five professionals in the restaurant industry.

The petitioner was put on notice of required evidence and given a reasonable opportunity to provide it for the record before the visa petition was adjudicated. The petitioner failed to submit the requested evidence and now submits it on appeal. However, the AAO will not consider this evidence for any purpose. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). The appeal will be adjudicated based on the record of proceeding before the director.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) 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 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.

Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) interprets the term "degree" in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as its food and beverage manager. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's April 21, 2003 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to this evidence, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail: supervising the assistant manager, food, beverage and kitchen staff; managing the food and beverage department, including food preparation and food service; estimating food and beverage costs; ordering food, equipment, and supplies; supervising maintenance of equipment; directing the restaurant staff; conducting inventory; maintaining journals and records of various accounts; planning liquor, food inventory, and menus; maintaining standards of food and beverage quality and guest service quality established by management; achieving budgeted revenues, controlling expenses, and maximizing profitability within all areas of the food and beverage department; developing marketing programs and promotions; developing and implementing menu design; participating in the preparation of the annual budget and financial plans; maintaining procedures for the security of monies, credit and financial transactions, and inventory control; coordinating the handling of accounts with management; providing food and beverage services for meetings, groups, and social functions; cleaning the restaurant; maintaining and repairing kitchen equipment and fixtures; interviewing, selecting, training, supervising, counseling, and disciplining employees; scheduling work hours and directing activities; and investigating and resolving food quality and service complaints. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in hotel or hospitality management or an equivalent thereof.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the petitioner failed to establish any of the criteria found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the proposed duties, which require "a thorough theoretical and practical knowledge of accounting and budgeting procedures, process organization, hotel maintenance engineering, economics, and marketing analysis," are so complex as to require a related baccalaureate degree. Counsel states further that the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)* assigns the position an SVP rating of 7, which according to counsel, requires a degree to enter into the position. Counsel also states that the petitioner normally requires a degree for the proffered position.

Counsel additionally states as follows: "Notwithstanding the above argument, we are still providing the requested documentation. 1. Letter from the client-Mobile Web Surf, stating the nature of the project that the beneficiary is working on the duration of the same; 2. Consulting service agreement between Insync Information Systems and Mobile Web Surf, showing that the petitioner is providing consulting services to the client; 3. Assignment Exhibit, showing that the beneficiary [REDACTED] is the consultant developing the project for Mobile Web Surf, and the petitioner will be paid \$52.00/hr for the services. 4. We have an approved LCA for Fremont, California, which we have attached. This LCA has not been used before." Counsel's conclusion is as follows: "From the explanation given above and the enclosed supporting documentation, it is apparent that the job offered is not speculative, and that the petitioner has a genuine need for the services of the beneficiary, if fact [sic] the petitioner would not be able to full-fill [sic] its contractual obligations, unless the request for the extension of the beneficiaries [sic] H-1B status is approved. In view of

the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the beneficiary holds a managerial position in the company, and therefore the petition should be approved.”

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has established none of the four criteria outlined in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Therefore, the proffered position is not a specialty occupation.

The AAO turns first to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2): a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position; a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations; or a particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree.

Factors often considered by CIS when determining these criteria include: whether the Department of Labor’s *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry’s professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms “routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals.” See *Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1165 (D.Min. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Slattery*, 764 F. Supp. 872, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The AAO does not concur with counsel that the proffered position, which is that of a food service manager, is a specialty occupation. No evidence in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a food service manager job. Additionally, portions of counsel’s brief clearly apply to a different petitioner and a different beneficiary. The record, however, provides no explanation for these inconsistencies. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner’s proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988).

Counsel’s reference to and assertions about the relevance of information from the *DOT* are not persuasive. The *DOT*’s SVP rating does not indicate that a particular occupation requires the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation. An SVP rating is meant to indicate only the total number of years of vocational preparation required for a particular position. The classification does not describe how those years are to be divided among training, formal education, and experience, nor specifies the particular type of degree, if any, that a position would require.

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner’s industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for food and beverage managers. There is no evidence, however, to show that the employers issuing those postings are similar to the petitioner, or that the advertised positions are parallel to the instant position. The advertisements are for food service positions in the hotel industry. The petitioner, however, is not a hotel. Thus, the advertisements have no relevance.

The record also does not include any evidence from professional associations regarding an industry standard, or documentation to support the complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position. The petitioner, therefore, has not established the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) or (2).

The AAO now turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) – the employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position. On appeal, counsel states that the record contains evidence that the petitioner “has previously employed a person [REDACTED] with the equivalent of a bachelor’s degree in hotel management.” The record contains a foreign diploma for the above-mentioned employee. The record, however, does not contain an evaluation of this employee’s credentials from a service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(3). As such, the petitioner has not met its burden of proof in this regard. See *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(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.

To the extent that they are depicted in the record, the duties do not appear so specialized and complex as to require the highly specialized knowledge associated with a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty. Therefore, the evidence does not establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

The petitioner noted that CIS approved another petition that had been previously filed on behalf of the beneficiary. The director's decision does not indicate whether he reviewed the prior approval of the other nonimmigrant petition. If the previous nonimmigrant petition was approved based on the same unsupported and contradictory assertions that are contained in the current record, the approval would constitute material and gross error on the part of the director. The AAO is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. See, e.g. *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 597 (Comm. 1988). It would be absurd to suggest that CIS or any 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).

Furthermore, the AAO's authority over the service centers is comparable to the relationship between a court of appeals and a district court. Even if a service center director had approved the nonimmigrant petition on behalf of the beneficiary, the AAO would not be bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. *Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS*, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D. La.), *aff'd*, 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S.Ct. 51 (2001).

As related in the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director’s denial of the petition.

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. The petition is denied.