

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

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090**



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

**PUBLIC COPY**

D7

DATE:

**JAN 30 2012**

OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE:

Petitioner:  
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION:

Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker under Section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, California Service Center, denied the petition for a nonimmigrant visa. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant petition seeking to classify the beneficiary as an L-1B nonimmigrant intracompany transferee with specialized knowledge pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). The petitioner, a foreign company qualified to do business in California, is a software services company. It claims to be a branch office of [REDACTED] located in Bangalore, India. The petitioner is a new office seeking to employ the beneficiary as a Software Specialist for an initial period of three years.

The director denied the petition on January 26, 2010 concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that sufficient physical premises were secured to house the new operation. Specifically, the director found that the submitted office services agreement was deficient in that it did not secure physical premises for the beneficiary for the 36 month requested period and the agreement only provided space for one employee.

The petitioner subsequently filed an appeal. The director declined to treat the appeal as a motion and forwarded the appeal to the AAO for review. On appeal, the petitioner requests reconsideration of the denial based on "changed facts."

To establish eligibility for the L-1 nonimmigrant visa classification, the petitioner must meet the criteria outlined in section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Act. Specifically, a qualifying organization must have employed the beneficiary in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity, or in a specialized knowledge capacity, for one continuous year within three years preceding the beneficiary's application for admission into the United States. In addition, the beneficiary must seek to enter the United States temporarily to continue rendering his or her services to the same employer or a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a managerial, executive, or specialized knowledge capacity.

Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) state, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Upon review, the AAO concurs with the director's decision and affirms the denial of the petition. The petitioner has not identified an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact on the part of the director as a basis for the appeal, but simply appeals "due to change of facts as regards to our lease conditions."

In support of the appeal, the petitioner submits a new Office Service Agreement dated November 19, 2009 showing that three people may be placed in the newly-secured office. The agreement runs for a period of 36 months and does not restrict the petitioner from placing the company's name on the doors of the office. In a letter dated February 15, 2010, the petitioner states that "[i]n light of the above changed facts, we hereby appeal to your good office to please reconsider your decision."

As a preliminary matter, the petitioner filed the nonimmigrant petition on March 11, 2009. The new Office Services Agreement was not entered into until November 19, 2009, after the date of filing. The petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm'r 1978).

Furthermore, inasmuch as the petitioner has not identified specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.