



DR

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

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



File: SRC-99-074-51150 Office: Texas Service Center

Date: NOV 27 2001

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)

Public Copy

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: SELF-REPRESENTED

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 computer software consulting and development business with 15 employees and an estimated gross annual income of \$2.5 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst for a period of two years. The director determined the petitioner had not obtained a certification from the Department of Labor that it had filed an LCA in the occupational specialty, and in the location which the beneficiary would be employed, before filing the present petition.

On appeal, the petitioner's office manager states in part that:

We are requesting that this application be reopened because the reason for the rejection was that we sent the wrong LCA with this petition and in response to your request for additional evidence. Smyrna being a part of the Atlanta Metropolitan Area, we have enclosed the Atlanta LCA with the proper dates for this applicant.

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 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.

The record now contains three certified labor condition applications. The first labor condition application which indicates

that the beneficiary would be employed in Santa Clara, California, was certified on July 7, 1998. A second application which indicates that the beneficiary would be employed in Smyrna, Georgia, was certified on April 7, 1999, a date subsequent to January 6, 1999, the filing date of the visa petition. A third application which indicates that the beneficiary would be employed in Atlanta, Georgia, was certified on February 4, 1999, a date subsequent to January 6, 1999, the filing date of the petition. As the record indicates that the beneficiary would be employed in Smyrna, Georgia, it is determined that the proper labor condition application for the present petition is the one which contains the Smyrna, Georgia address. Regulations at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B)(1) provide that before filing a petition for H-1B classification in a specialty occupation, the petitioner shall obtain a certification from the Department of Labor that it has filed a labor condition application. Since this has not occurred, it is concluded that the petition may not be approved.

It is also noted that the labor condition application with the Atlanta, Georgia address appears to have been altered as follows: in Part 7(c), the number "20" appears to be an alteration as the "2" appears to be written rather than typed.

Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. Further, it is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies will not suffice. Matter of Ho, 19 I&N Dec. 582. (Comm. 1988).

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.