

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**

Δ,



FILE: WAC 07 139 50183 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **JUN 06 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 of the service center denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and affirmed her decision in a subsequent motion to reopen and/or reconsider. 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 consulting, development and training business 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 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 1, 2007. Although the petitioner filed the Form I-129 petition on April 10, 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 ground 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. Specifically, the director found that as of the petition's filing date of April 10, 2007, the beneficiary had not received his master's degree or completed all the requirements prior to filing.

On appeal, the petitioner's president contends that the beneficiary is exempt from the H-1B visa cap pursuant to 214(g)(5)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(C), and submits an undated letter from the head of the engineering department of McNeese State University at Lake Charles, Louisiana, who states, in part:

“[The beneficiary] completed all of the requirements for the Master of Engineering Degree on April 4, 2007. His degree was awarded on May 12, 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), and supporting documentation; (2) the director's denial letter; (3) the petitioner's motion to reopen and/or reconsider; (4) the director's decision affirming the denial of the petition; and (5) the Form I-290B, and supporting documentation.

Section 214(g)(5)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(A) 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.”

As discussed above, on appeal the petitioner submitted a letter from the head of the engineering department of McNeese State University at Lake Charles, Louisiana, who states that the beneficiary completed all the requirements for a master's degree in engineering on April 4, 2007, and that the beneficiary's degree was awarded on May 12, 2007. The petitioner submitted copies of the beneficiary's diploma and transcript with a graduation date of May 12, 2007.

Although the head of the engineering department states that the beneficiary completed all the requirements for a master's degree in engineering on April 4, 2007, the master's degree was not awarded by McNeese State University on or before the petition's April 10, 2007 filing date. The exemption criterion at section 214(g)(5)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(C), requires that the beneficiary earn a "master's or higher degree from a United States institution of higher learning." The evidence presented by the petitioner does not establish that the beneficiary earned a master's degree from McNeese State University before the Form I-129 petition was filed. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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 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 earned 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

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.