U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: LIN 02 255 51307 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: [redacted] 2004

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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:

[redacted]

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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.

Mari Johnson

for 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 "multi-units restaurant management" business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a general manager of operations. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to 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).

The director denied the petition because the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

Section 214(i)(l) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184 (i)(l), 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 a general manager of operations. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's July 19, 2002 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 supervise the petitioner's food services operation. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in management and administration or an equivalent thereof.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the proposed duties are not so complex that a baccalaureate degree is required. The director found further that 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 petitioner normally requires a baccalaureate degree in a related field. According to counsel, the proposed duties, which include, in part, accounting, marketing, and operation analysis, are so complex that a baccalaureate degree is required. Counsel states further that this requirement is industry wide.

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 is a specialty occupation. A review of the Food Service Managers job description in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, confirms the accuracy of the director's assessment to the effect that the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a food service manager.

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for various positions. These postings, however, do not demonstrate that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty is required for entry into the positions. For example, one of the advertised positions is that of an operations consultant for a Dairy Queen, whose requirements are described as follows: "Bachelor's degree in business, education, marketing or hotel/restaurant management required – or – Associates degree with a minimum of two years experience with IDQ. . . ." It is noted here that an associate degree and two years of related experience do not equate to a baccalaureate degree for CIS purposes. Another advertised position is that of an "Assistant Manager II, Restaurant" for Disneyland, whose requirements are described as follows: "College degree or 2-4 years equivalent experience." Again, this description demonstrates that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty is not a requirement. It is also noted that the record contains no evidence to show that the employers issuing those postings are similar to the petitioner, or that the advertised positions are

parallel to the instant position. For example, one of the advertised positions is that of an operations manager for one of the largest U.S. manufacturers of metal containers. The petitioner's industry, however, is not in manufacturing. Thus, the advertisements have little 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 has, thus, 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 submits job announcements to demonstrate that it normally requires a baccalaureate degree in a related field for the proffered position. Other than the petitioner's job advertisements, however, the record does not contain any evidence of the petitioner's past hiring practices and therefore, 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).

Furthermore, even if CIS were to conclude that the petitioner normally requires a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, CIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation, regardless of the petitioner's past hiring practices. *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 baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.[1] In this regard, the petitioner fails to establish that the general manager of operations position it is offering to the beneficiary entails the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge.

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

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.

---

[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." *See id.* at 387.