identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
I.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals, MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

D2

FILE: EAC 07 146 50425 OFFICE: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER DATE: **AUG 11 2009**

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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:

[redacted]

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of $585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom
Acting 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 is engaged in providing IT consulting and development. It seeks to employ the beneficiary[1] as a computer systems analyst and, 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).

On December 26, 2007, the director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. On appeal, the petitioner submits two letters, an amended I-129 Petition, a newly-certified Labor Condition Application (LCA), a contract between the petitioner and a company named NSSolutions, Inc. (NSSOL), and an offer of employment letter to the beneficiary from the petitioner.

The record includes: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the director's RFE; (4) the director's denial decision; and, (5) the Form I-290B, along with documentation submitted in support of the appeal. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

When filing the Form I-129 petition, the petitioner averred in both the petition and the letter of support that it would employ the beneficiary as a computer systems analyst. The petitioner indicated on the LCA that the beneficiary would work in Dallas, Texas and listed Freemont, California as an "additional or subsequent work location." The petitioner also indicated on the LCA that it was not H-1B dependent or a willful violator. The LCA was certified by the Department of Labor on March 28, 2007.

The director found the initial evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued an RFE on June 25, 2007. In the request, among other things, the director: asked the petitioner to submit evidence that the petitioner has engaged in the regular, continuous and systematic provision of goods or services; asked the petitioner to submit documentation of its business activities for the past year; asked the petitioner to submit its Form 941, Quarterly Tax Return; asked the petitioner to submit evidence that the proffered position is a specialty occupation; and asked for a list of employees to include the degree that each employee holds.

In a response dated September 15, 2007, counsel addressed the director's queries. Regarding whether the position is a specialty occupation, counsel set forth the duties of the position the petitioner was offering to the beneficiary and delineated the percentages of time that the beneficiary would devote to certain functions. Counsel asserted that the job of computer systems analyst is recognized as a professional position, and it submitted information from some Department of Labor publications, such as *O*Net*.

On December 26, 2007, the director denied the petition. The director declined to find that the proffered position was a specialty occupation because, as an employment contractor, the petitioner was in the business

[1] On the I-129 Petition, the petitioner listed the beneficiary's country of birth and citizenship as India. The beneficiary is, however, a native and citizen of Malaysia.

of contracting its employees to client sites and the record did not contain any evidence regarding the type of duties that the beneficiary would perform for these various clients. The director concluded that, without evidence regarding what duties the beneficiary would actually perform for the clients, the proffered position could not be classified as a specialty occupation.

On appeal, the petitioner submits two letters, an amended I-129 Petition, a newly-certified Labor Condition Application (LCA), a contract between the petitioner and NSSOL, and an offer of employment letter to the beneficiary from the petitioner. The petitioner contends that in March 2007, it signed a contract with NSSOL, which it renewed in September 2007 after some clauses in the Master Agreement changed. The petitioner also submits an amended I-129 Petition and a new LCA, which was certified on January 23, 2008, to reflect that the beneficiary's job location will be in Dallas, Texas only and to reflect that the petitioner was H-1B dependent when it filed the petition. The petitioner submits the amended I-129 Petition because of the "material changes" in the beneficiary's job duties.

Upon review of the record, the AAO agrees with the director's decision to deny the petition. Beyond the director's decision, the AAO also finds that the petitioner has not established that it qualifies as a United States employer or agent. As a preliminary issue, however, the AAO will first address the petitioner's attempt on appeal to amend the petition that it filed on April 2, 2007. The petitioner explains that, because the initial petition remains pending and it renewed a contract for a project to which the beneficiary will be assigned, it is submitting a new I-129 Petition and LCA to reflect the beneficiary's new job duties. The petitioner states that such an action is required by the regulations.

The regulation to which the petitioner refers is found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(E), and which states:

> The petitioner shall file an amended or new petition, with fee, with the Service Center where the original petition was filed to reflect any material changes in the terms and conditions of employment or training or the alien's eligibility as specified in the original approved petition. An amended or new H-1C, H-1B, H-2A, or H-2B petition must be accompanied by a current or new Department of Labor determination. In the case of an H-1B petition, this requirement includes a new labor condition application.

Although the petitioner was correct in believing that he needed to file an amended petition with a new LCA due to the change in the beneficiary's proposed employment, it was incorrect in believing that it could simply supplement the petition that it had already filed rather than submit a new I-129 Petition with fee. Any material changes in proposed employment require, per the regulation cited above, the filing of an I-129 Petition along with a new fee.

The AAO now turns to the basis for the petition's denial - whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. It should be noted that for purposes of the H-1B adjudication, the issue of *bona fide* employment is viewed within the context of whether the petitioner has offered the beneficiary a position that is determined to be a specialty occupation. Therefore, of greater importance to this proceeding is whether the petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to establish that the services to be performed by the beneficiary are those of a specialty occupation.

Section 214(i)(1) of 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:

> An 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.

Thus, it is clear that Congress intended this visa classification only for aliens who are to be employed in an occupation that requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge that is conveyed by at least a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty.

Consistent with section 214(i)(1) of the Act, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) states that a specialty occupation means an occupation "which [1] 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 [2] 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 also 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.

As a threshold issue, it is noted that 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must logically be read together with section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). In other words, this regulatory language must be construed in harmony with the thrust of the related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *See K Mart Corp. v. Cartier Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996). As such, the criteria stated in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) should logically be read as being necessary but not necessarily sufficient to meet the statutory and regulatory definition of specialty occupation. To otherwise interpret this section as stating the necessary *and* sufficient conditions for meeting the definition of specialty occupation would result in particular positions meeting a condition under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) but not the statutory or regulatory definition. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 387 (5th Cir. 2000). To avoid this illogical and absurd result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as stating additional requirements that a position must meet, supplementing the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

Consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) consistently 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 proffered position. Applying this standard, USCIS regularly approves H-1B petitions for qualified aliens who are to be employed as engineers, computer scientists, certified public accountants, college professors, and other such professions. These occupations all require a baccalaureate degree in the specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation and fairly represent the types of professions that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category. To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, USCIS does not simply rely on a position's title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations, are factors to be considered. USCIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, to determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384.

In support of this analysis, USCIS routinely cites *Defensor v. Meissner,* 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000), in which an examination of the ultimate employment of the beneficiary was deemed necessary to determine whether the position constitutes a specialty occupation. The petitioner in *Defensor*, Vintage Health Resources (Vintage), was a medical contract service agency that brought foreign nurses into the United States and located jobs for them at hospitals as registered nurses. The court in *Defensor* found that Vintage had "token degree requirements," to "mask the fact that nursing in general is not a specialty occupation." *Id.* at 387.

The court in *Defensor* held that for the purpose of determining whether a proffered 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." *Id* at 388. 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 *Defensor* 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 proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation on the basis of the requirements imposed by the entities using the beneficiary's services. *Id.*

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv) provides that "[a]n H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation shall be accompanied by [d]ocumentation . . . or any other required evidence sufficient to establish . . . that the services the beneficiary is to perform are in a specialty occupation." Moreover, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv)(A)*(1)* specifically lists contracts as one of the types of evidence that may be required to establish that the services to be performed by the beneficiary will be in a specialty occupation.

On the Form I-129, the petitioner stated that the proffered position is that of a computer systems analyst, and it supplied a generic computer systems analyst job description for the beneficiary. Although the LCA that accompanied the petition stated that the beneficiary would be working in Dallas, Texas or, in the alternative, Freemont, California, the petitioner did not specify the location of the beneficiary's employment such as whether the beneficiary would be working at the petitioner's office space or in some other location. The petitioner did not submit any evidence that it had a specialty occupation in existence for the beneficiary to fill when it filed the petition.

For the first time on appeal, the petitioner submits a contract between it and a company named NSSOL,[2] as well as an offer of employment letter to the beneficiary, which is dated May 15, 2008. According to the petitioner, the contract and employment offer establish the existence of a specialty occupation for the beneficiary. The contract is dated September 10, 2007 for services to begin on February 14, 2008 and end in December 2009. The contract lists the beneficiary's duties as:

> Studying and analyzing the present business processes, creation of enterprise structure for Java/J2EE or Microsoft based systems, process and assignment of organizational data on Oracle/DB2/MS SQL Server/Sybase data bases, designing and launching new products. Analyze user requirements using UML, procedures, and problems to automate or improve existing systems in COBOL/Java/JCL/Mainframe and review and enhance computer system capabilities, workflow and scheduling limitations, [and] generate reports using Crystal Reports. Analyze and recommend commercially available software like BW/MM/SD to improve existing systems and processes.

The offer of employment letter from the petitioner to the beneficiary, dated May 15, 2008, also sets forth the same duties stipulated in the NSSOL contract and also informs the beneficiary that, at the completion of the NSSOL contract, he will be working on in-house projects such as *Automation Framework* and *Bug Tracker.*

The contract with NSSOL that now forms the basis of the beneficiary's position establishes quite convincingly that the petitioner did not have a specialty occupation to offer the beneficiary when it filed the petition, and would not have had such a position in which to employ the beneficiary had U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) approved the petition for the requested October 1, 2007 start date.

To establish eligibility for this nonimmigrant visa classification, a petitioner must prove the existence of a specialty occupation position as of the date of filing. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978). Additionally, the position must exist as of the start date requested by the petitioner.

---

[2] Although the petitioner stated in its appellate letter that the contract between it and NSSOL was submitted in response to the director's RFE, no copy of such contact is found in the record.

The contract that forms the basis of the petitioner's job offer came into existence after the petitioner filed the petition. It, therefore, cannot be used to establish that the petitioner had a job to offer the beneficiary when it filed the petition. More importantly, the contract has a start date of February 14, 2008 for the beneficiary's services, which is four months after the petitioner's requested start date of October 1, 2007. Had USCIS approved the petition with an October 1, 2007 start date, the petitioner has not demonstrated that it could have immediately employed the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position for that four-month period of time until the NSSOL contract began.

Furthermore, even if the AAO were to accept this contract as evidence of the beneficiary's duties, it would still not suffice. The listed job duties of the beneficiary are not clearly those associated with a specialty occupation, and the client, NSSOL, does not describe what qualifications the incumbent must have to successfully perform the tasks. Additionally, the project that encompasses this contract does not have an end date. Although the petitioner states that the beneficiary will work on an in-house project when the NSSOL contract ends, the evidence of the petitioner's in-house projects is not sufficient. The one-page description of *Bug Tracker* and the User's Guide for *Automation Framework* do not contain any information regarding when these projects came into existence or their anticipated completion dates. The submission of a User's Guide implies that the *Automation Framework* system has already been completed, which calls into question why the beneficiary would need to be working on such a project at the conclusion of the NSSOL contract. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

The petitioner's failure to provide evidence of an existing specialty occupation at the time of filing the petition renders the AAO unable to assess whether the beneficiary's 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 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)*.

Even if the petitioner had overcome the director's determination that no specialty occupation position existed, the petition would still not be approvable because the petitioner has failed to establish that it meets the regulatory definition of an intending United States employer or an agent. Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Specifically, the AAO must determine whether the petitioner has established that it will have "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." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii)*(2)*.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), defines an H-1B nonimmigrant as an alien:

> (i) who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services . . . in a specialty occupation described in section 1184(i)(1) . . ., who meets the requirements of the occupation specified in section 1184(i)(2) . . ., and with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines . . . that the intending employer has filed with the Secretary an application under 1182(n)(1).

"United States employer" is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as follows:

> *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.

Although "United States employer" is defined in the regulations, it is noted that "employee," "employed," "employment," and "employer-employee relationship" are not defined for purposes of the H-1B visa classification even though these terms are used repeatedly in both the Act and the regulations, including within the definition of "United States employer" at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act indicates that an alien coming to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation will have an "intending employer" who will file a labor condition application with the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 212(n)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1). The intending employer is described as offering full-time or part-time "employment" to the H-1B "employee." Sections 212(n)(1)(A)(i) and 212(n)(2)(C)(vii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(n)(1)(A)(i) and 1182(n)(2)(C)(vii). Further, the regulations indicate that "United States employers" must file Form I-129 in order to classify aliens as H-1B temporary "employees." 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(1) and 214.2(h)(2)(i)(A). Finally, the definition of "United States employer" indicates in its second prong that the petitioner must have an "employer-employee relationship" with the "employees under this part," i.e., the H-1B beneficiary, and that this relationship be evidenced by the employer's ability to "hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of any such employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "United States employer"). Accordingly, neither the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) nor U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has defined the terms "employee," "employed," "employment," or "employer-employee relationship" by regulation for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, even though the law describes H-1B beneficiaries as being "employees" who must have an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer."[3] Therefore, for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, these terms are undefined.

---

[3] It is noted that, in certain limited circumstances, a petitioner might not necessarily be the "employer" of an H-1B beneficiary. Under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F), it is possible for an "agent" who will not be the actual "employer" of the H-1B temporary employee to file a petition on behalf of the actual employer and the beneficiary. However, the regulations clearly require H-1B beneficiaries of "agent" petitions to still be employed by "employers," who are required by regulation to have "employer-employee relationships" with respect to these H-1B "employees." *See id.*; 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(1) and 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "United States employer"). As such, the requirement that a beneficiary have a United States employer applies equally to single petitioning employers as well as multiple non-petitioning employers represented by "agents" under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F). The only difference is that the ultimate, non-petitioning employers of the H-1B employees in these scenarios do not directly file petitions.

The Supreme Court of the United States has determined that where federal law fails to clearly define the term "employee," courts should conclude that the term was "intended to describe the conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine." *Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. v. Darden*, 503 U.S. 318, 322-323 (1992) (hereinafter "*Darden*") (quoting *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. 730 (1989)). That definition is as follows:

> In determining whether a hired party is an employee under the general common law of agency, we consider the hiring party's right to control the manner and means by which the product is accomplished. Among the other factors relevant to this inquiry are the skill required; the source of the instrumentalities and tools; the location of the work; the duration of the relationship between the parties; whether the hiring party has the right to assign additional projects to the hired party; the extent of the hired party's discretion over when and how long to work; the method of payment; the hired party's role in hiring and paying assistants; whether the work is part of the regular business of the hiring party; whether the hiring party is in business; the provision of employee benefits; and the tax treatment of the hired party.

Darden, 503 U.S. at 323-324; *see also Restatement (Second) of Agency* § 220(2) (1958); *Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates, P.C. v. Wells*, 538 U.S. 440 (2003) (hereinafter "*Clackamas*"). As the common-law test contains "no shorthand formula or magic phrase that can be applied to find the answer, . . . all of the incidents of the relationship must be assessed and weighed with no one factor being decisive." *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324 (quoting *NLRB v. United Ins. Co. of America*, 390 U.S. 254, 258 (1968).[4]

---

[4] While the *Darden* court considered only the definition of "employee" under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(6), and did not address the definition of "employer," courts have generally refused to extend the common law agency definition to ERISA's use of employer because "the definition of 'employer' in ERISA, unlike the definition of 'employee,' clearly indicates legislative intent to extend the definition beyond the traditional common law definition." *See, e.g., Bowers v. Andrew Weir Shipping, Ltd.*, 810 F. Supp. 522 (S.D.N.Y. 1992), *aff'd*, 27 F.3d 800 (2nd Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1000 (1994). However, in this matter, the Act does not exhibit a legislative intent to extend the definition of "employer" in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, "employment" in section 212(n)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, or "employee" in section 212(n)(2)(C)(vii) of the Act beyond the traditional common law definitions. Instead, in the context of the H-1B visa classification, the term "United States employer" was defined in the regulations to be even more restrictive than the common law agency definition. A federal agency's interpretation of a statute whose administration is entrusted to it is to be accepted unless Congress has spoken directly on the issue. *See Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 844-45 (1984).

The regulatory definition of "United States employer" requires H-1B employers to have a tax identification number, to employ person(s) in the United States, *and* to have an "employer-employee relationship" with the H-1B "employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Accordingly, the term "United States employer" not only requires H-1B employers and employees to have an "employer-employee relationship" as understood by common-law agency doctrine, it imposes additional requirements of having a tax identification number and to employ person(s) in the United States. The lack of an express expansion of the definition regarding the terms "employee," "employed," "employment" or "employer-employee relationship" indicates that the regulations

Therefore, in considering whether or not one is an "employee" in an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer" for purposes of H-1B nonimmigrant petitions, USCIS will focus on the common-law touchstone of control. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. Factors indicating that a worker is an "employee" of an "employer" are clearly delineated in both the *Darden* and *Clackamas* decisions. 503 U.S. at 323-324; *see also Restatement (Second) of Agency* § 220(2) (1958). Such indicia of control include when, where, and how a worker performs the job; the continuity of the worker's relationship with the employer; the tax treatment of the worker; the provision of employee benefits; and whether the work performed by the worker is part of the employer's regular business. *See Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; *cf. New Compliance Manual*, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, § 2-III(A)(1), (EEOC 2006) (adopting a materially identical test and indicating that said test was based on the *Darden* decision); *see also Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 388 (5th Cir. 2000) (determining that hospitals, as the recipients of beneficiaries' services, are the true "employers" of H-1B nurses under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h), even though a medical contract service agency is the actual petitioner, because the hospitals ultimately hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiaries).

It is important to note that the factors listed in *Darden* and *Clackamas* are not exhaustive and must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Other aspects of the relationship between the parties may affect the determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists. Furthermore, not all or even a majority of the listed criteria need be met; however, the fact finder must weigh and compare a combination of the factors in analyzing the facts of each individual case. The determination must be based on all of the circumstances in the relationship between the parties, regardless of whether the parties refer to it as an employee or as an independent contractor relationship. *See Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; *New Compliance Manual* at § 2-III(A)(1).

Likewise, the "mere existence of a document styled 'employment agreement'" shall not lead inexorably to the conclusion that the worker is an employee. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. "Rather, as was true in applying common-law rules to the independent-contractor-versus-employee issue confronted in *Darden*, the answer to whether a shareholder-director is an employee depends on 'all of the incidents of the relationship . . . with no one factor being decisive.'" *Id.* at 451 (quoting *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324).

Applying the *Darden* and *Clackamas* tests to this matter, the petitioner has not established that it will be a "United States employer" having an "employer-employee relationship" with the beneficiary as an H-1B temporary "employee." The AAO notes that the evidence in the record establishes that the petitioner is an

---

do not intend to extend these terms beyond "the traditional common law definition." Thus, in the absence of an intent to impose broader definitions by either Congress or USCIS, the "conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine," and the *Darden* construction test, apply to the terms "employee," "employer-employee relationship," "employed" and "employment" as used in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, section 212(n) of the Act, and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h). That being said, there are instances in the Act where Congress may have intended a broader application of the term "employer" than what is encompassed in the conventional master-servant relationship. *See, e.g.*, section 214(c)(2)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(c)(2)(F) (referring to "unaffiliated employers" supervising and controlling L-1B intracompany transferees having specialized knowledge); section 274A of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1324a (referring to the employment of unauthorized aliens).

employment contractor that contracts work with clients for IT consulting. As stated by the petitioner and as the evidence in the record supports, it places H-1B beneficiaries in various locations to work on client projects.

To qualify as a United States employer, all three criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) must be met. The Form I-129 and the petitioner's federal tax returns contained in the record indicate that the petitioner has an Internal Revenue Service Tax Identification Number. The petitioner did not, however, submit an employment contract or any other document signed by the beneficiary and the petitioner when the petition was filed that described the beneficiary's claimed employment relationship with the petitioner. The contract that the petitioner entered into with NSSOL on September 10, 2007 is not only dated after the petition was filed,[5] but also fails to establish that the petitioner, not NSSOL, would control the work of the beneficiary. Based upon the record before the AAO, there is no evidence that a valid employer-employee relationship existed between the petitioner and the beneficiary on April 2, 2007. The evidence is insufficient to establish that the petitioner qualifies as an employer, as defined by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

Similarly, the petitioner could not be classified as an agent. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F) provides for two types of agents: (1) "an agent performing the function of an employer"; and (2) "a company in the business as an agent involving multiple employers as the representative of both the employers and the beneficiary." The petitioner has not submitted any evidence to establish that it could be considered an agent. Thus, as the petitioner is neither a U.S. employer nor an agent, the petition may not be approved for this additional reason.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a de novo basis. 5 U.S.C. 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's de novo authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989).

For the reasons set forth above, the petitioner has failed to overcome the director's reasons for denying the petition and, upon its own *de novo* review, the AAO has found that the petitioner is not a U.S. employer or agent. Therefore, the petition is not approvable.

Pursuant to section 291 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, the burden of proof is upon the petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking. Here, the petitioner has not met its burden. Accordingly, the AAO affirms the director's decision to deny the petition and dismisses the appeal.

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

---

[5] As stated in a previous section of this decision, eligibility must be established when a petition is filed. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978). The signing of an employment contract for the beneficiary's services after the filing of the petition, and the petitioner's offer of employment letter that is signed subsequent to the petition's filing are just two items of evidence that establish the non-existence of an employer-employee relationship as of April 2, 2007, the date of the I-129 Petition's filing.