



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

102

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: EAC-99-082-52012 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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a engineering consultant and contracting firm with 15 employees and a gross annual income of \$5 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a civil engineer for an unspecified period of time. The director determined the petitioner had not submitted a certified labor condition application.

On appeal, counsel submits a statement. Counsel also indicates that additional material would be forthcoming within thirty days of the filing of the appeal. However, as of the date of this decision, no additional material has been submitted by counsel or any party to this proceeding. Therefore, the appeal shall be adjudicated upon the basis of the evidence currently contained in the record.

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), provides in part for nonimmigrant classification to qualified aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(1), defines a "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and 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 section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

The director denied the petition because the record did not contain a certified labor condition application from the Department of Labor. On appeal, counsel asserts that the Service's denial of the petition was unfair because the petitioner was not provided sufficient time to produce the certified labor condition application.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(B), the petitioner shall submit the following with an H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation:

1. A certification from the Secretary of Labor that the petitioner has filed a labor condition application with the Secretary,
2. A statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application for the duration of the alien's authorized period of stay, and
3. Evidence that the alien qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation.

Counsel's statements on appeal are not persuasive. Counsel fails to cite any legal precedent which would tend to support her contention that the Service did not provide the petitioner sufficient time and opportunity to obtain a certified labor condition application. A review of the record reveals that the petitioner submitted the H-1B petition to the Service on February 8, 1999, but failed to include a certified labor condition application. On March 12, 1999, the director issued a notice to counsel which requested that the petitioner submit additional documentation in support of the petition, including the certified labor condition application. The director informed both counsel and the petitioner that the requested documents must be submitted within twelve weeks of the date of the notice pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(8). While counsel did respond to the Service's notice, a certified labor condition application was not included. The record does not contain any reasonable explanation as to why the petitioner has failed to submit a certified labor condition application. The petitioner has not overcome the objections of the director, however, as the record as it is presently constituted does not contain a certified labor condition application. For this reason the petition may not be approved.

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. Accordingly, the decision of the director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.