

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



D,

FILE: WAC 07 138 52676 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUN 30 2008

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

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 appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is a software consulting, training and development company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a system 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 ground the petitioner had failed to demonstrate the existence of a specialty occupation, or that the petitioner has three years of specialty occupation work for the beneficiary.

On appeal, counsel contends that the director erred in denying the petition.

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.

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

[A]n 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) 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, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiary.¹ See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). In view of this evidence, the AAO finds that the petitioner will be the employer of the beneficiary.

The petition may not be approved, however, as the petition does not establish that the beneficiary will be employed in a specialty occupation or that the employer has submitted an itinerary of employment.

The petitioner states on appeal that the beneficiary would perform his duties at the petitioner’s place of business but “since we are a software developing company that provide consulting and business solutions to a large number of clients from various industries, the beneficiary would be also required to complete assignments at other company’s, [sic] where we would be required to provide services.” The petitioner did not submit evidence of the contracts or projects that the beneficiary will work on while employed at the petitioner’s home office.

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

Although the petitioner will act as the beneficiary's employer, the evidence of record establishes that the petitioner is an employment contractor in that the petitioner will place the beneficiary at work locations to perform services established by contractual agreements for third-party companies.

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 in such situations. 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 the evidence contained in the record at the time the petition was filed did not establish that the petitioner had three years of work for the beneficiary to perform, the director properly exercised her discretion to require an itinerary of employment.²

In her April 25, 2007 request for additional evidence, the director stated that, "the evidence indicates that the petitioner is engaged in the business of software consulting and is seeking the beneficiary's services as a systems analyst." The director requested, in part, contractual agreements, statements of work, work orders, service agreements, a comprehensive description of the beneficiary's proposed duties from the entity where the beneficiary would perform services, and an itinerary that specified the dates of each service or engagement.

In its July 16, 2007 response to the director's request for additional evidence, the petitioner stated that it would be the beneficiary's actual employer, that the beneficiary would always be its employee, and that "some assignments to client's sites would be required." The petitioner submitted contracts from the following companies: (1) Walgreen Company; (2) United Stationers Supply Company; and, (3) SAP America, Inc. However, none of these documents specifically request the services of the beneficiary, and do not indicate that the beneficiary was selected from the petitioner's qualified workers. None of these contracts have any effect until task orders are issued. The record contains no task orders with the beneficiary's itinerary or describing the work to be performed by the beneficiary. 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 petitioner has not complied with the requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) and the petition was properly denied.

In addition, the contracts between the petitioner and Walgreen Company and United Stationers Supply Company were signed in 2005, two years prior to the date the instant petition was filed in April 2007. The petitioner does not submit any evidence to indicate that these contracts have not expired and are still valid. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes 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)). In addition, the contract between the petitioner and SAP America, Inc. is not signed by SAP America, Inc. The only signature on this agreement is that of the petitioner. In addition, the date of the agreement is May 8, 2007, one month after the instant petition was filed. The petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978).

² As noted by Assistant Commissioner Aytes in the cited 1995 memorandum, "[t]he purpose of this particular regulation is to [e]nsure that alien beneficiaries accorded H status have an actual job offer and are not coming to the United States for speculative employment."

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 any of 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. Further, the petitioner has not established the existence of ongoing in-house projects to employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation in between contractual assignments. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. at 165. 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)(iii)(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)(1).

Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO finds that the record does not establish that the LCA is valid for all work locations. As the record does not contain an itinerary for the period of employment, it cannot be determined that the LCA is valid for the work locations. For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

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).

The petitioner has failed to establish that it has an itinerary of employment for the beneficiary, that the beneficiary would be coming temporarily to the United States to perform the duties of a specialty occupation, or that the LCA is valid for the work locations. Accordingly, the AAO will 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.