

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

DZ

JAN 25 2009

FILE: WAC 06 210 50006 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

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:

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The director of the service center 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 motel that seeks to employ the beneficiary as an operations manager. The petitioner, therefore, 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.

Counsel checked the block indicating that he would be sending a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days. The AAO sent a fax to counsel on December 10, 2007, informing him that no separate brief and/or evidence was received, to confirm whether or not he had sent anything else in this matter, and as a courtesy, providing him with five days to respond. In response, counsel submitted a brief and additional evidence; however, no evidence of the original filing date was included. Although counsel has not established that the brief was timely filed, the submission will be considered.

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

The issue before the AAO is whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the job it is offering to the beneficiary meets the following statutory and regulatory requirements.

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.

The term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) 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.

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) consistently interprets the term “degree” in the above criteria to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, CIS does not simply rely on a position’s title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity’s business operations, are factors to be considered. CIS 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 nor 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.

The petitioner seeks the beneficiary’s services as an operations manager. Evidence of the beneficiary’s duties includes: the petitioner’s May 22, 2006 letter in support of the petition and the petitioner’s November 15, 2006 response to the director’s RFE. As stated by the petitioner, the proposed duties and time spent performing such duties are as follows:

1. Conduct analysis of management operational problems and formulate solutions (25%);
2. Analyze, conceptualize, and define problems, select plans, and make proposals (25%);
3. Prepare reports to management defining problems and solutions (25%); and

4. Assist in the design and evaluation of options and management, training, and evaluation of staff (25%).

The director found that the proposed operations manager duties do not require a bachelor's degree. Citing the Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, the director noted that the minimum requirement for entry into the position was not a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. The director concluded 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 asserts, in part, that the director denied the petition in error. Counsel also asserts that a minimum of a bachelor's degree for an operations manager in the petitioner's industry is the industry standard. As supporting documentation, counsel submits job postings.

Preliminarily, the AAO observes that the petitioner has not sufficiently detailed the proffered position's duties to enable the AAO to conclude that the proffered position comprises the duties of a specialty occupation. Although the petitioner claims that the beneficiary would conduct analysis of management operational problems, select plans, make proposals, and prepare reports to management, this overview of an "occupation" is insufficient to establish the proffered position as a specialty occupation. The petitioner must detail its expectations of the proffered position and must provide evidence of the duties that comprise the proffered position as it relates specifically to the petitioner's business.

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 *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. Minn. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

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. In the context of the petitioner's business, a stated motel/resort/marina with six employees and a gross annual income of over \$600,000, the AAO finds that the job duties are those of a lodging manager as described in the *Handbook*. No evidence in the *Handbook*, 2006-07 edition, indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required for lodging manager jobs. Further, although information on the petition that was signed by the petitioner's manager on May 22, 2006, reflects that the petitioner has six employees, the petitioner provides no evidence in support of this claim, such as quarterly wage

reports. It is noted that the petitioner's 2005 federal income tax return reflects \$31,200 paid in compensation of officers, and only \$49,474 paid in salaries and wages. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Accordingly, the petitioner has not established the proffered position as a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(iii)(A)(I).

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, counsel submits Internet job postings for managerial positions in the hospitality industry. The listings provided either fail to offer meaningful descriptions of the positions advertised or rely on duties unlike the duties listed by the petitioner. The listings do not indicate that the businesses publishing the advertisements are similar to the petitioner in size, number of employees, or level of revenue. Further, the majority of the advertisers, which include the Hyatt New Brunswick, Celebrity Resorts, Extended Stays Hotels, Staybridge Suites Hotel Denver-Cherry Creek, Harrah's Entertainment, and Red Roof Inn, do not specify the requirement of a bachelor's degree in a specialty. It is noted that employer preference is not synonymous with the normally required language of the regulation. Of further note, as the record offers only a generalized description of the proffered position, the duties listed in the advertisements may not be established as parallel to those outlined by the petitioner. The record also does not include any evidence from individuals, firms, or professional associations regarding an industry standard. Accordingly the petitioner has not established that the degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations.

Counsel also stated that CIS has already determined that the proffered position is a specialty occupation since CIS has approved another, similar petition in the past on behalf of the beneficiary. This record of proceeding, however, does not contain all of the supporting evidence submitted to CIS in the prior case. In the absence of all of the corroborating evidence contained in other record of proceeding, the information submitted by counsel is not sufficient to enable the AAO to determine whether the position offered in the prior case was similar to the position in the instant petition.

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, CIS 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 case was similar to the proffered position or was approved 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, however, the approval of the prior petition would have been erroneous. CIS is not required to approve 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). Neither CIS 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).

In the alternative, the petitioner may show that the proffered position is so complex or unique that only an individual with a degree can perform the work associated with the position. In the instant petition, the petitioner has submitted insufficient documentation to distinguish the proffered position from similar but

non-degreed employment as a lodging manager. The petitioner has failed to establish the proffered position as a specialty occupation under either prong of the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(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. As counsel does not address this issue on appeal, it will not be discussed further. The evidence of record does not establish this criterion.

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.

The AAO here incorporates its discussion regarding the lack of concrete evidence substantiating the actual duties of the proffered position. As indicated in the discussion above, the record of proceeding lacks evidence of specific duties that would establish such specialization and complexity. 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 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.

Although the director did not make a specific determination regarding the eligibility of the beneficiary to perform H-1B level services, the AAO observes beyond the decision of the director, that while the record contains an evaluation of the beneficiary's education, training, and employment experience, the record lacks corroborating evidence such as a comprehensive description of the beneficiary's duties from his foreign employers to demonstrate the beneficiary's qualifications as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C). Thus, CIS cannot assess the credibility of the evaluation. An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis). For this additional reason, the petition will not be approved.

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

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.