

identifiers, can be used to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



D1

FILE: LIN 03 106 51823 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: AUG 24 2005

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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.

Robert P. Wiemann

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained. The petition will be approved.

The petitioner is a health sciences publisher that seeks to extend the employment of the beneficiary as a systems analyst. The petitioner 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 director denied the petition on the basis that the beneficiary had already attained the maximum six-year statutory and regulatory limit on the total amount of time that an alien may remain in H-1B status. On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(13)(iii)(A):

An H-1B alien in a specialty occupation . . . who has spent six years in the United States under section 101(a)(15)(H) and/or (L) of the Act may not seek extension, change status or be readmitted to the United States under section 101(a)(15)(H) or (L) of the Act unless the alien has resided and been physically present outside the United States, except for brief trips for business or pleasure, for the immediate prior year.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's denial letter; (3) the director's request for additional evidence (RFE); (4) the materials that the petitioner submitted in response to the RFE; (5) the director's denial letter; and (6) the Form I-290B and counsel's brief on appeal, including its attached exhibits. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The beneficiary in this proceeding was afforded H-1B classification from March 27, 1997 through February 14, 2003 (a period of 5 years, 10 months, and 18 days), and this petition for extension of classification was filed on February 12, 2003. At the time the instant petition was filed, counsel submitted documentation clearly establishing that the beneficiary had been outside the United States for a total of 138 days during the six years, and the director acknowledged this fact in his decision. Counsel stated that the beneficiary's H-1B status should be extended by the same number of days that he was outside the country. The director disagreed, determining that time spent outside the country during the validity period of a petition must be counted towards the alien's maximum stay in the United States, unless that time was interruptive of the alien's employment. The director stated that time outside the United States that is considered part of a normal work period, such as weekends and vacations, cannot be considered interruptive of employment, and that the time cannot be reclaimed for purposes of extending the six-year limit. The AAO disagrees with the director.

The regulation states, "An H-1B alien . . . who has spent six years in the United States under section 101(a)(15)(H) and/or (L) of the Act may not seek extension." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(13)(iii). Section 214(g)(4) of the Act states, "In the case of a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), the period of authorized admission as such a nonimmigrant may not exceed 6 years." Section 101(a)(13)(A) of the Act

states, "The terms 'admission' and 'admitted' mean, with respect to an alien, the lawful entry of the alien in the United States after inspection and authorization by an immigration officer." The plain language of the statute and the regulations indicates that the six-year period accrues after admission into the United States. This premise is further supported and explained by the court in *Nair v. Coultice*, 162 F. Supp. 2d 1209 (S.D. Cal. 2001).

The AAO finds that the time that counts toward the maximum six-year period of authorized stay is time that the beneficiary spends in the United States after lawful admission in H-1B status. In this case, the beneficiary was admitted to the United States in H-1B status each time he returned from outside the country. The total period for which he could have been in lawful H-1B status in the United States was six years. When he was outside the country, the beneficiary was not in any status for U.S. immigration purposes. By virtue of departing the country, the beneficiary stopped the period that he was in H-1B status, and renewed that status with each readmission to the United States. The director should have granted an extension of the beneficiary's H-1B status for the total number of days that the petitioner proved the beneficiary was out of the country, i.e., 138 days.

The AAO notes that the petitioner is in the best position to organize and submit the proof of the beneficiary's departures from and reentry into the United States. The submission of copies of passport stamps or Form I-94 arrival-departure records, without an accompanying statement or chart of dates spent out of the country by the beneficiary, would be subject to error in interpretation and would not be considered probative and may be rejected. Similarly, a statement of dates spent outside of the country must be accompanied by consistent, clear and corroborating proof of departures from and reentries into the United States. The petitioner must submit supporting documentary evidence 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 burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The petition is approved.