


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



02

FILE: EAC 07 142 52016 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 30 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, Vermont Service Center, 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 provides software consulting and development services. It 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 2008 fiscal-year cap for the issuance of H-1B visas, set by section 214(g)(1)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(1)(A), was reached on April 2, 2007. Although the petitioner filed the Form I-129 petition on April 19, 2007, the petition was accepted and adjudicated because the petitioner indicated on the Form I-129 that the beneficiary met the cap exemption criterion at section 214(g)(5)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(C), as a beneficiary who, in the words of the Act, "has earned a master's or higher degree from a United States institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))."

The director denied the petition on the basis that the beneficiary did not meet the requirements specified in section 214(g)(5)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(C), and thus the beneficiary was subject to the annual cap. The director noted that the evidence of record did not show that the beneficiary had been awarded a master's degree by a United States institution of higher learning and did not show that the beneficiary had completed all the requirements for a master's degree when the petition was filed.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the beneficiary had completed an overwhelming majority of the requirements of his master's degree from Wayne State University prior to filing the petition and fulfilled all the requirements as demonstrated by the issuance of the master's degree on May 1, 2007. Counsel notes that the beneficiary could not submit the diploma on April 19, 2007 when the petition was filed because Wayne State University had not granted the diploma at that point due to the general administrative process. Counsel asserts that if Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) had issued a request for further evidence (RFE), the beneficiary would have submitted a copy of his master's degree to establish his eligibility. Counsel attaches a copy of the beneficiary's Master of Science degree in Electrical Engineering issued on May 1, 2007.

The AAO bases its decision upon its consideration of all of the evidence in the record of proceeding, including: (1) the petitioner's Form I-129 (Petition for Nonimmigrant Worker) filed April 19, 2007 and the supporting documentation filed with it; (2) the director's July 31, 2007 denial letter; and (3) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation.

Section 214(g)(5)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(C) as modified by the American Competitiveness in the Twenty-first Century Act (AC21), Pub. L. No. 106-313 (October 17, 2000), states, in relevant part, that the H-1B cap shall not apply to any nonimmigrant alien issued a visa or otherwise provided status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act who "has earned a master's or higher degree from a United States institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C.

1001(a)) until the number of aliens who are exempted from such numerical limitation during such year exceeds 20,000."

The evidence presented by the petitioner does not establish that the beneficiary earned a master's degree from Wayne State University before the Form I-129 petition was filed on April 19, 2007. The AAO observes that a response to an RFE would only confirm that the beneficiary had not been issued a master's degree when the petition was filed. CIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12). A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or the beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978).

The AAO finds that the evidence of record does not establish that the beneficiary is exempt from the H-1B visa cap under the requirements of section 214(g)(5)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(C) because the beneficiary had not been issued a master's degree at the time that the petition was filed. Accordingly, the AAO will not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

As always, 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 that burden.

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