

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

81



FILE: WAC 07 083 50170 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **MAR 17 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

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 provider of computer programmers and engineers to a wide network of clients for various information technology projects. It 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 director denied the petition determining that the petitioner had not established that it qualifies as a U.S. employer, that the proffered position is a specialty occupation, or that its labor condition application (LCA) is valid.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (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 request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B, with the petitioner's brief. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before reaching its decision.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii):

*Specialty occupation* means an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in field 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.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must 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.

Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) interprets the term "degree" in the above criteria to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), *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.

In a January 24, 2007 letter submitted in support of the petition, the petitioner described the proposed duties of the proffered programmer analyst position as follows:

Perform requirement analysis, design and testing of projects using .net framework, LINUX, MySql, and SQL Server. Interact with clients to get business requirements and project roadmap. Develop and implement technology solutions for clients.

The record also includes an LCA submitted at the time of filing listing the beneficiary's work location in Forest Hills, New York as a programmer analyst.

In an RFE, the director requested additional information from the petitioner, including copies of contracts between the petitioner and its clients for whom the beneficiary would be performing services, along with any statements of work/work orders, and/or service agreements for the beneficiary.

In response to the RFE, the petitioner submitted a list of its employees, H-1B approval notices, quarterly tax returns, and payroll documentation.

The director denied the petition finding that the petitioner had not established that it qualified as a U.S. employer or that the proffered position qualified as a specialty occupation, as the petitioner failed to provide contracts with the end-users where the beneficiary would perform programmer analyst duties. The director also found that, as the petitioner had not submitted an LCA with the locations of such end-users, it had not demonstrated that it had complied with the terms and conditions of the LCA.

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a list of the properties that it owns and/or manages. The petitioner stated that the beneficiary “would be actively involved in developing Real Estate Software to manage [the petitioner’s] real estate properties and mainly be involved in resolving disputes between Landlord and Tenant” and “upgrading [the petitioner’s] DOS based File Pro Software to Windows based Software.” As supporting documentation, the petitioner submitted a project report, a list of tenants, and payroll information.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), *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.

Preliminarily, the AAO finds that the evidence of record is sufficient to establish that the petitioner will act as the beneficiary's employer in that it will hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiary, as set out in the petitioner’s January 24, 2007 letter and the various contracts between the petitioner and its clients.<sup>1</sup> See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

The Aytes memorandum cited at footnote 1, indicates that the director has the discretion to request that the employer who will employ the beneficiary in multiple locations submit an itinerary. Upon review, the director properly exercised her discretion to request additional information regarding the beneficiary's ultimate employment, as the petitioner indicated in its January 24, 2007 letter that the beneficiary would be working at the petitioner’s client sites. Although the AAO declines to find that the petitioner is acting as the beneficiary's agent, the petitioner in this matter is employing the beneficiary to work for its clients or its clients' clients, and thus can be described as an employment contractor.

When a petitioner is an employment contractor, the entity ultimately employing the alien or using the alien's services must submit a detailed job description of the duties that the alien will perform and the qualifications

---

<sup>1</sup> See also Memorandum from Michael L. Aytes, Assistant Commissioner, INS Office of Adjudications, *Interpretation of the Term “Itinerary” Found in 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) as it Relates to the H-1B Nonimmigrant Classification*, HQ 70/6.2.8 (December 29, 1995).

that are required to perform the job duties. *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). From this evidence, CIS will determine whether the duties require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.

The petitioner's assertion on appeal that the beneficiary will manage its real estate properties, resolve landlord/tenant disputes, and upgrade the petitioner's software, is noted. This assertion, however, conflicts with information in the petitioner's January 24, 2007 letter that the beneficiary would interact with its clients to get business requirements and project roadmaps, and develop and implement technology solutions, as described in the petitioner's contracts. The record contains no explanation for this inconsistency. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988).

In this matter, the petitioner does not provide substantive evidence that the duties of the proffered position incorporate the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge that requires the 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. Only a detailed job description from the entity that requires the alien's services will suffice to meet the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). The petitioner did not submit the requested evidence in response to the director's RFE pertaining to contracts, statements of work, work orders, and/or service agreements between the petitioner and its clients for whom the beneficiary would be performing services, along with any statements of work, work orders, or service agreements for the beneficiary. 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)). Thus, as the nature of the proposed duties are unclear, the AAO is precluded from determining whether the offered position is one that would normally impose the minimum of a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established the proffered position as a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(iii)(A)(I).<sup>2</sup>

In that the record does not contain a description of work from the end user of the beneficiary's services, the petitioner is also precluded from meeting the requirements of the three remaining alternate criteria at 8 C.F.R.

---

<sup>2</sup> The AAO observes that the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook* reports that there are many training paths available for programmers and that although bachelor's degrees are commonly required, certain jobs may require only a two-year degree or certificate; that most employers prefer to hire persons who have at least a bachelor's degree and broad knowledge of a variety of computer systems and technologies for positions of computer software engineer; and that there is no universally accepted way to prepare for a job as a systems analyst, although most employers place a premium on some formal college education.

§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Without a job description entailing programmer analyst duties, the petitioner may not establish the position's duties as parallel to any degreed positions within similar organizations in its industry or distinguish the position as more complex or unique than similar, but non-degreed, employment, as required by alternate prongs of the second criterion. Absent a descriptive listing of the programmer analyst duties the beneficiary would perform under contract, the petitioner cannot establish that it previously employed degreed individuals to perform such duties, as required by the third criterion. Neither can the petitioner satisfy the requirements of the fourth criterion by distinguishing the proffered position based on the specialization and complexity of its duties.

Upon review of the totality of the record, the record fails to reveal sufficient evidence that the offered position requires a bachelor's degree, or its equivalent, in a specific discipline. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(B), the petitioner shall submit the following with an H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation:

1. A certification from the Secretary of Labor that the petitioner has filed a labor condition application with the Secretary,
2. A statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application for the duration of the alien's authorized period of stay,
3. Evidence that the alien qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation. . . .

The director also found that, as the petitioner had not submitted an LCA with the locations of the end-users where the beneficiary will ultimately perform the proposed programmer analyst duties, it had not demonstrated that it had complied with the terms and conditions of the LCA. On appeal, the petitioner does not address this finding.

As discussed above, the petitioner did not submit the requested evidence in the director's RFE pertaining to contracts, statements of work, work orders, and/or service agreements between the petitioner and its clients for whom the beneficiary would be performing services. As the beneficiary's ultimate worksite is unclear, it has not been shown that the work would be covered by the locations on the LCA. For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

In view of the foregoing, the petitioner has not overcome the director's objections. For these reasons, the petition may not be approved. Accordingly, the AAO shall 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 sustained that burden.

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