




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

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



DZ


FILE: EAC 04 207 53419 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **MAY 16 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 Michael T. Kelly*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) remanded a subsequent appeal to the director for entry of a new decision. The director has denied the petition and certified his decision to the AAO for review. The director's decision will be affirmed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is an IT services and software development company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst. The petitioner, therefore, seeks 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 July 22, 2004 denial letter; (3) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation, dated August 20, 2004; (4) the AAO's August 18, 2006 remand of the petition to the director; (7) the director's December 4, 2006 request for additional evidence; and (8) the director's April 4, 2007 notice of certification. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

In its August 18, 2006 decision, the AAO determined that, although the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a specialty occupation, the petitioner had not established that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the AAO remanded the matter to the director for his determination of whether the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation, with certification to the AAO should his decision be adverse to the petitioner.

In his December 4, 2006 request for additional evidence, the director afforded the petitioner 84 days to submit evidence regarding the proposed position's status as a specialty occupation. However, the petitioner did not respond. Accordingly, the director determined that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate that its proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation, and certified his decision to the AAO for review. The contents of these documents are part of the record and their contents need not be repeated here.

As the petitioner chose not to respond to the director's request for additional evidence or submit evidence to the AAO to rebut the findings of the director's notice of certification, it has not established that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation under any of the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Therefore, the director's decision will be affirmed.

For reasons related in the preceding discussion, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation under any of the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). 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 director's April 4, 2007 decision is affirmed. The petition is denied.