




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



PUBLIC COPY

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



D2

FILE: WAC 07 146 53144 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **JUN 24 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:


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 a software development and consulting company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer 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 that the petitioner had not established that it would comply with the terms and conditions of the labor condition application (LCA) certified for the location of intended employment. The director noted that the "nature of the petitioner's business, locating and placing aliens with computer backgrounds into positions with firms that use computer programmers and/or analysts to complete their projects, is such that multiple employment locations would be expected."

On appeal, counsel contends that the director erred in denying the petition. Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is the actual employer, rather than an agent, of the beneficiary. Counsel further asserts that the LCA is valid as the petitioner's main offices are located in Livonia, Michigan. Counsel further states that the regulations under 20 C.F.R. § 655.730(c)(5) allow the petitioner to file additional LCA's for unanticipated locations after the initial petition is filed.

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 AAO disagrees with the director’s finding that the petitioner would not act as the beneficiary’s employer. 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 and withdraws the director’s decision to the contrary.

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).

The director found that the record did not establish that the LCA was valid for the work location specified on the LCA, Livonia, Michigan. In response to the director's request for evidence, the petitioner submitted evidence indicating that the petitioner might place the beneficiary in Leonia, New Jersey or Irving, Texas. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner cites to the regulations at 20 C.F.R. § 655.730(c)(5) that states "all intended places of employment shall be identified on the LCA; the employer may file one or more additional LCAs to identify additional places of employment." The petitioner failed to provide evidence that the certified LCA for Livonia, Michigan is valid for the intended employment, or that the petitioner had on file a certified LCA for the location of intended employment. Further, 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. The director was correct to deny the petition on this ground.

Beyond the decision of the director, 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.

In response to the director's request for evidence, the petitioner submitted several "typical contracts" between the petitioner and its clients. In reviewing these contracts, the services provided by the petitioner to its clients include "temporary workers," "professional services," or "consultants," to work at the client's worksite. Thus, the beneficiary would be assigned to client projects outside its place of business as the needs of each project is dictated and prescribed by the client.

Accordingly, the AAO concludes that, 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 his discretion to require an itinerary of employment.²

In its June 20, 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 it would comply with the LCA. Counsel further stated that the petitioner is not an agent and is therefore not required to submit an itinerary. However, as noted previously, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) requires employers to submit an itinerary with the dates and locations of employment in situations where the employment will occur in more than one location. 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).

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."

In response to the request for evidence, counsel submitted contracts from the following companies: (1) Tektronix Texas, LLC; (2) World Networking Services, Inc.; (3) SpinSci Technologies, LLC; and, (4) Info Visions Consultants, 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 work orders (referred to as "work order," in the case of the contract with Tektronix Texas, LLC and World Networking Services, Inc., and "purchase order" in the case of the contracts with SpinSci Technologies, LLC and Info Visions Consultants, Inc.) are issued. The record contains no work orders or purchase orders with the beneficiary's itinerary. 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 evidence contained in the record does not satisfy 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) as it does not cover the entire period of the beneficiary's employment by the petitioner. Thus, 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.

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. 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). For these additional reasons, 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 sustained that burden.

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