

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

81



FILE: WAC 07 139 51216 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAR 12 2008

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:



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 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 and development 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 5, 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 5, 2007, the beneficiary had not received his master's degree or completed all the requirements prior to filing.

On appeal, counsel 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 a letter from the professor and chairman of Fenn College of Engineering at Cleveland State University, who states, in part:

“[The beneficiary] had completed all the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Electrical Engineering prior to April 3, 2007. The University's administrative process did not allow us to award the actual diploma until May 11, 2007. For all purposes, [the beneficiary] is considered to have graduated prior to April 3, 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 the supporting documentation filed with it; (2) the director's denial letter; and (3) 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 counsel submitted a letter from the professor and chairman of Fenn College of Engineering at Cleveland State University, who states that the beneficiary completed all the requirements for a master’s degree in electrical engineering prior to April 3, 2007, and that the University’s administrative process did not allow for the diploma to be awarded until May 11, 2007. He concludes that the beneficiary is considered “for all purposes” to have graduated prior to April 3, 2007. Counsel submitted a copy of the beneficiary’s diploma with a graduate date of May 11, 2007.

Although the professor and chairman states that the beneficiary is considered to have graduated prior to April 3, 2007, the master’s degree was not awarded by Cleveland State University on or before the petition’s April 5, 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 Cleveland 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.