

identifying data deleted to
prevent fear of unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services


PUBLIC COPY



D2


FILE: WAC 06 151 53075 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **SEP 12 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.

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 engaged in information technology consulting, and it seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors to extend the beneficiary's classification 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 director denied the petition finding that the petitioner did not meet the statutory definition of a "United States employer" or an agent, and had not demonstrated the existence of a specialty occupation.

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.

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.

In response to the director’s request for evidence, the petitioner asserts that it will be the “actual employer” of the beneficiary. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner further asserts that the petitioner “determines where the beneficiary is to be placed, and can choose to remove him from the position and transfer him elsewhere at any time,” and will “retain full control over the alien and his job duties.” 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). The petition may not be approved, however, as the record does not establish that the beneficiary will be employed in a specialty occupation, that the employer has submitted an itinerary of employment for the entire period of employment requested by the petitioner on the Form I-129, or that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the specialty occupation.

The petitioner’s letter of support dated April 4, 2006, indicated that the beneficiary’s duties would include analyzing the needs of its clients and developing software solutions. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the petitioner “determines where the beneficiary is to be placed, and can choose to

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).

remove him from the petition and transfer him elsewhere at any time.” Counsel further stated that if the programmer analyst is not placed at a specific site, he will be placed at the petitioner’s worksite and will be “utilized for [the petitioner’s] own programming needs.” Thus, 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 if the beneficiary’s duties will be performed in more than one location. As noted above, the petitioner asserts that the beneficiary will be placed at several client sites, however, the petitioner failed to submit an itinerary with the dates and locations of the client work sites in which the beneficiary will be placed.

The AAO agrees with the director that the petition does not establish that the beneficiary will be employed in a specialty occupation. Again, 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. However, the petitioner did not provide a job description for the duties the beneficiary will perform for the third-party companies. The petitioner also failed to submit a contract or work order evidencing the duties to be performed by the beneficiary. 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.

Moreover, the director requested, in his April 21, 2006 request for additional evidence, several documents to describe the conditions of employment, such as contracts, works order, service agreements or letters from authorized officials of the ultimate client company; however, the petitioner did not submit any of the requested documentation. The regulation states that the petitioner shall submit additional evidence as the director, in his or her discretion, may deem necessary. The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8) and (12). The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

As the record does not contain 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)(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)(I). Thus, the petition may not be approved.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of the 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 petitioner seeks to establish that the beneficiary is qualified under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4). The petitioner may also establish that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a specialty occupation if he holds a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate degree pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(2). Accordingly, the AAO turns to the governing regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D). Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D), equating a beneficiary's credentials to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree is determined by one or more of the following:

- (1) An evaluation from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience;
- (2) The results of recognized college-level equivalency examinations or special credit programs, such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI);
- (3) An evaluation of education by a reliable credentials evaluation service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials;
- (4) Evidence of certification or registration from a nationally-recognized professional association or society for the specialty that is known to grant

certification or registration to persons in the occupational specialty who have achieved a certain level of competence in the specialty;

- (5) A determination by the Service that the equivalent of the degree required by the specialty occupation has been acquired through a combination of education, specialized training, and/or work experience in areas related to the specialty and that the alien has achieved recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation as a result of such training and experience.

The petitioner submitted the beneficiary's resume; a copy of the bachelor of computer science engineering degree awarded to the beneficiary by Nagarjuna University, located in India; copies of grade reports for the beneficiary from Nagarjuna University; and one employment reference letter on behalf of the beneficiary.

As the beneficiary was awarded a bachelor's degree from a University in India, and the petitioner did not submit documentation as required under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C) or 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D), equating a beneficiary's credentials to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree, the record does not establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation position. 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 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 met this burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.