

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


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Room 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D 1

PUBLIC COPY




FILE: EAC 05 212 51906 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **JUL 05 2007**

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.

for
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The director's decision will be withdrawn. The petition will be remanded for entry of a new decision.

The petitioner is an information technology services provider that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer-analyst. 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 record of proceeding before the AAO contains (1) the 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) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The director denied the petition on the basis of his determination that the beneficiary is unqualified to perform the duties of a programmer-analyst. On appeal, counsel disputes this finding and asserts that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, an alien must meet one of the following criteria:

- (1) Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (2) Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (3) Hold an unrestricted state license, registration or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
- (4) Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation, and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

The director found the beneficiary unqualified to perform the duties of the proposed position on the basis of his determination that the beneficiary's degree in civil engineering was inadequate preparation for a career as a programmer-analyst.

The AAO routinely relies upon the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (the *Handbook*) for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The *Handbook* notes that employers prefer applicants with technical degrees for programmer analyst positions, and that engineering degrees are acceptable for such positions.

Therefore, the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a programmer-analyst, and the director's decision to the contrary is withdrawn.

However, the AAO may not approve the petition at this time, as the record does not establish that the petitioner will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation. Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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 proposed position.

The term “employer” is defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii):

United States employer means a person, firm, corporation, contractor, or other association, or organization in the United States which:

- (1) Engages a person to work within the United States;
- (2) Has an employer-employee relationship with respect to employees under this part, as indicated by the fact that it may hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of any such employee; and
- (3) Has an Internal Revenue Service Tax identification number.

The evidence of record establishes that the petitioner will act as the beneficiary’s employer in that it will hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiary.¹ See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

¹ See also Memorandum from Michael L. Aytes, Assistant Commissioner, INS Office of Adjudications,

Although the petitioner will act as the beneficiary's employer, it appears from the evidence of record, as it presently stands, that the petitioner is an employment contractor in that it would place the beneficiary at work locations to perform services established by contractual agreements for third-party organizations. It does not appear as though the beneficiary would perform his duties at the petitioner's place of business.

Pursuant to the language at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B), employers must submit an itinerary with the dates and locations of employment if the beneficiary's duties will be performed in more than one location.

While the Aytes memorandum cited at footnote 1 broadly interprets the term "itinerary," it provides CIS the discretion to require that the petitioner submit the dates and locations of the proposed employment. As it does not appear from the record that the beneficiary would perform his duties directly for the petitioner but would rather perform them for third-party companies, the director in this case should exercise her discretion to request an itinerary of employment for the period of requested employment.²

The record as presently constituted contains no contracts, work orders or statements of work from the entity or entities for whom the beneficiary would provide his services. It does not contain an itinerary. Absent such information, the petitioner has not established that it has three years' worth of H-1B-level work for the beneficiary to perform.

The record also does not establish that the proposed position is a specialty occupation. The court in *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000) held that for the purpose of determining whether a proposed position is a specialty occupation, the petitioner acting as an employment contractor is merely a "token employer," while the entity for which the services are to be performed is the "more relevant employer." The *Defensor* court recognized that evidence of the client companies' job requirements is critical where the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner. The court held that the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service had reasonably interpreted the statute and regulations as requiring the petitioner to produce evidence that a proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation on the basis of the requirements imposed by the entities using the beneficiary's services.

As the record does not contain any documentation that establishes the specific duties the beneficiary would perform under contract for the petitioner's clients, the AAO cannot analyze whether these duties would require at least a baccalaureate degree or the equivalent in a specific specialty, as required for classification as a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation under any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(A), or that the beneficiary would be coming temporarily to the United States to perform the duties of a specialty occupation pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(B)(I). The petition, therefore, may not be approved at this time.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the AAO has determined that the record fails to establish that the beneficiary would be performing services in a specialty occupation, as defined in section 214(i)(l) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(l) or that the employer has submitted an itinerary of employment. However, the director did not address these issues. Therefore, the director's decision will be withdrawn and the matter

Interpretation of the Term "Itinerary" Found in 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) as it Relates to the H-1B Nonimmigrant Classification, HQ 70/6.2.8 (December 29, 1995).

² If the petitioner establishes that it is not an employment contractor and that the beneficiary would perform services directly for the petitioner, then, of course, the itinerary would not be required. In any event, the record in this case must be clarified.

remanded for the entry of a new decision. The director may afford the petitioner reasonable time to provide evidence pertinent to the issue of whether the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation based upon particularized evidence of specific duties that the beneficiary would perform for the petitioner's clients, and to provide an itinerary of services to be performed, if necessary, with the dates and locations of the proposed employment. The director shall then render a new decision based on the evidence of record as it relates to the regulatory requirements for eligibility. As always, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361.

ORDER: The director's January 24, 2006 decision is withdrawn. The petition is remanded to the director for entry of a new decision, which, if adverse to the petitioner, is to be certified to the AAO for review.