



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

Δ,

[Redacted]

FILE: WAC 08 181 51587 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **DEC 02 2009**

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. 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 \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

  
Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The service center director denied the immigrant 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 private school that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a “Middle Years Programme Coordinator/Humanities & Language Arts Teacher.” 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 on the basis of her determination that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) had received sufficient numbers of H-1B petitions to reach the statutory numerical limitation set by section 214(g)(1)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(1)(A), for the Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) at the time the petition was filed, and that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate its exemption from that numerical cap. The director found that the petitioner had failed to establish that the beneficiary would be working in a program that is jointly managed that is affiliated with an institution of higher education. On appeal, counsel contends that the petitioner is indeed exempt from the numerical cap, and that the director therefore erred in denying the petition.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains the following: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director’s request for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner’s response to the director’s request; (4) the director’s denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

As noted previously, H-1B visas are, in general, numerically capped by statute. Pursuant to section 214(g)(1)(A) of the Act, the total number of H-1B visas issued per fiscal year may not exceed 65,000. On April 3, 2007, USCIS issued a notice that it had received sufficient numbers of H-1B petitions to reach the H-1B cap for FY08, which covers requested employment start dates of October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2008.

The petitioner filed the Form I-129 on June 13, 2008 and requested an employment start date of July 1, 2008. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(8)(ii), any non-cap exempt petition filed on or after April 4, 2007 and requesting a start date during FY08 must be rejected. However, because the petitioner indicated on the Form I-129 that it is a nonprofit organization or entity related to or affiliated with an institution of higher education, and thus exempt from the FY08 H-1B cap pursuant to section 214(g)(5) of the Act, the petition was not rejected by the director when it was initially received by the service center. The director denied the petition on July 31, 2008.

Upon review, the petitioner has not established that it is exempt from the FY08 H-1B cap pursuant to section 214(g)(5) of the Act.

I. Law

Section 214(g)(5)(A) of the Act, 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 “is employed (or has received an offer of employment) at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))), or a related or affiliated nonprofit entity . . . .”

For purposes of H-1B cap exemption for an institution of higher education, or a related or affiliated nonprofit entity, the H-1B regulations adopt the definition of institution of higher education set forth in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, (Pub. Law 89-329), 20 U.S.C. § 1001(a), defines an institution of higher education as an educational institution in any state that:

- (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;
- (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;
- (3) provides an educational program for which the institution awards a bachelor’s degree or provides not less than a 2-year program that is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;
- (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and
- (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or if not so accredited, is an institution that has been granted preaccreditation status by such an agency or association that has been recognized by the Secretary for the granting of preaccreditation status, and the Secretary has determined that there is satisfactory assurance that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time.

With regard to institutions of higher education, the legislative history that accompanies AC21 provides in relevant part the following:

This section exempts from the numerical limitation (1) individuals who are employed or receive offers of employment from an institution of higher education, affiliated entity, nonprofit research organization or governmental research organization and (2) individuals who have a petition filed between 90 and 180 days after receiving a master’s degree or higher from a U.S. institution of higher education. The principal reason for the first exemption is that by virtue of what they are doing, people working in universities are necessarily immediately contributing to

educating Americans. The more highly qualified educators in specialty occupations we have in this country, the more Americans we will have ready to take positions in these fields upon completion of their education. Additionally, U.S. universities are on a different hiring cycle from other employers. The H-1B cap has hit them hard because they often do not hire until numbers have been used up; and because of the academic calendar, they cannot wait until October 1, the new fiscal year, to start a class.

Sen. Rep. No. 106-260 at 21-22 (April 11, 2000). While the rationale for granting an exemption to the H-1B cap for institutions of higher education might appear at first glance to support granting a similar exemption to primary and secondary schools, nothing in the statutory language or legislative history of AC21 indicates that it was the intent of Congress to do so through this legislation. The H-1B cap exemption provisions of AC21 make no reference to primary or secondary schools, and the legislative history of AC21 does not indicate any congressional intent that such schools be included within the definition of institutions of higher education.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, the AAO observes that Congress, in exempting certain entities from the H-1B fee it imposed in the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act (ACWIA),<sup>2</sup> specifically listed institutions of “primary or secondary education” as exempt from the fee in addition to institutions of higher education. As stated by the Supreme Court in *Bates v. United States*, “[W]here Congress includes particular language in one section of a statute but omits it in another section of the same Act, it is generally presumed that Congress acts intentionally and purposely in the disparate inclusion or exclusion.” 522 U.S. 23, 29-30, 118 S.Ct. 285, 290, 139 L.Ed.2d 215 (1997) (quoting *Russello v. United States*, 464 U.S. 16, 23, 104 S.Ct. 296, 300, 78 L.Ed.2d 17 (1983), quoting *United States v. Wong Kim Bo*, 472 F.2d 720, 722 (C.A.5 1972)). As such, based on Congress’s inclusion of primary and secondary education institutions in section 214(c)(9) of the Act and its omission from section 214(g)(5) of the same act, it should be presumed that Congress intentionally and purposely acted to exclude primary and secondary education institutions from the exemption to the numerical limitations contained in section 214(g)(1)(A) of the Act.

## II. Analysis

The AAO therefore finds that neither the statutory language nor the legislative history demonstrates that Congress intended to exempt all nonprofit organizations that provide educational benefits to the

---

<sup>1</sup> See generally 146 Cong. Rec. S9643-05 (October 3, 2000) (Statements of Senators Harry Reid, John McCain, Spencer Abraham, Sam Brownback, Kent Conrad, Patrick Leahy and Orrin Hatch); 146 Cong. Rec. S9449-01 (September 28, 2000) (Statements of Senator Hatch, Abraham and Edward Kennedy); 146 Cong. Rec. S7822-01 (July 27, 2000) (Statement of Senator John Warner); 146 Cong. Rec. S538-05 (February 9, 2000) (Statements of Senators Hatch, Abraham and Phil Gramm).

<sup>2</sup> Enacted as title IV of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999, Pub. L. No. 105-277, 112 Stat. 2681, 2681-641.

United States. Rather, the “[c]ongressional intent was to exempt from the H-1B cap certain alien workers who could provide direct contributions to the United States through their work on behalf of institutions of higher education and related nonprofit entities . . . .” Memo from Michael Aytes, Assoc. Dir. for Domestic Operations, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Dept. Homeland Sec., to Reg. Dirs. & Serv. Ctr. Dirs., *Guidance Regarding Eligibility for Exemption from the H-1B Cap Based on §103 of the American Competitiveness in the Twenty-First Century Act of 2000 (AC21) (Public Law 106-313)* at 3 (June 6, 2006) (hereinafter referred to as the “Aytes Memo”).

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner is H-1B cap exempt under section 214(g)(5)(A) of the Act due to its relation to or affiliation with an institution of higher education. The AAO finds the evidence of record sufficient to establish that the petitioner, a Montessori school, is a nonprofit entity. In its June 7, 2008 letter of support, the petitioner stated that it is affiliated with the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics. According to the petitioner, the petitioner and the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics “operate joint student intern and outreach activities programs.”

On June 24, 2008, the director requested additional evidence to establish the petitioner’s affiliation with an institution of higher education as well as evidence to establish that the beneficiary would be working in the program managed jointly by the petitioner and an institution of higher education. The director found the petitioner’s response insufficient and accordingly denied the petition on July 31, 2008.

As a preliminary matter, the AAO finds that, if a petitioner is found to be an exempt employer, i.e., an institution of higher education or a related or affiliated nonprofit entity, there is no legal requirement that the beneficiary participate in a particular program. In other words, absent the issuance of regulations to the contrary, the on-site employment by an institution of higher education or a related or affiliated nonprofit entity is in itself sufficient to meet the plain statutory requirements of section 214(g)(5)(A) of the Act. As such, the AAO withdraws that portion of the director’s decision.

Having made that determination, the AAO turns next to the issue of whether the petitioner is “related to or affiliated with” the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics, such that it could be considered an exempt employer under section 214(g)(5)(A) of the Act.

According to USCIS policy, the definition of a “related or affiliated nonprofit entity” that should be applied in this instance is that found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B). *See* Aytes Memo at 4 (“[T]he H-1B regulations define what is an affiliated nonprofit entity for purposes of the H-1B fee exemption. Adjudicators should apply the same definitions to determine whether an entity qualifies as an affiliated nonprofit entities [*sic*] for purposes of exemption from the H-1B cap”).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B), which was promulgated in connection with the enactment of ACWIA, defines what is a related or affiliated nonprofit entity specifically for purposes of the H-1B fee exemption provisions:

*An affiliated or related nonprofit entity.* A nonprofit entity (including but not limited to hospitals and medical or research institutions) that is connected or associated with an institution of higher education, through shared ownership or control by the same board or federation operated by an institution of higher education, or attached to an institution of higher education as a member, branch, cooperative, or subsidiary.

The AAO, as a component of USCIS, generally follows official statements of policy issued by the agency, provided they are not in conflict with a higher legal authority. *See* USCIS Adj. Field Manual 3.4(b) (2009). By including the phrase “related or affiliated nonprofit entity” in the language of AC21 without providing further definition or explanation, Congress likely intended for this phrase to be interpreted consistently with the only relevant definition of the phrase that existed in the law at the time of the enactment of AC21: the definition found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B). As such, the AAO finds that USCIS reasonably interpreted AC21 to apply the definition of the phrase found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B), and it will defer to the Aytes Memo in making its determination on this issue.

The petitioner must, therefore, establish that it satisfies the definition at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B) as a related or affiliated nonprofit entity of an institution of higher education under section 214(g)(5)(A) of the Act in order for the beneficiary to be exempt from the FY08 H-1B cap. Reducing the provision to its essential elements, the AAO finds that 8 C.F.R. § 214(h)(19)(iii)(B) allows a petitioner to demonstrate that it is an affiliated or related nonprofit entity if it establishes one or more of the following:

- (1) The petitioner is associated with an institution of higher education through shared ownership or control by the same board or federation;
- (2) The petitioner is operated by an institution of higher education; or
- (3) The petitioner is attached to an institution of higher education as a member, branch, cooperative, or subsidiary.<sup>3</sup>

As noted previously, the petitioner claims relation to, or affiliation with, the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics. As evidence of such affiliation, the petitioner submits several letters, as well as an April 2, 2008 “Agreement” between the petitioner and the University of the Virgin Islands, as well as an August 15, 2008 “Memorandum of Agreement” between the petitioner and the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics.

---

<sup>3</sup> This reading is consistent with the Department of Labor’s regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.40(e)(ii), which is identical to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B) except for an additional comma between the words “federation” and “operated”. The Department of Labor explained in the supplementary information to its ACWIA regulations that it consulted with the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) on the issue, supporting the conclusion that the definitions were intended to be identical. *See* 65 Fed. Reg. 80110, 80181 (Dec. 20, 2000).

Turning to the definition of an “affiliated or related nonprofit entity,” the AAO must first consider whether the petitioner has established that it is a related or affiliated nonprofit entity pursuant to the first prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B): shared ownership by the same board or federation.

The evidence of record does not establish that the petitioner and the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics are owned or controlled by the same board or federation. Accordingly, the claimed affiliation or relationship with the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics does not satisfy the first prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B).

Having made that determination, the AAO turns next to a consideration of whether the petitioner has established that it is a related or affiliated non-profit entity pursuant to the second prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B): operation by an institution of higher education. The evidence of record does not show that an institution of higher education “operates” the petitioner within the common meaning of this term. As depicted in the record, the relationship that exists between the petitioner and each institution of higher education is one between two separately controlled and operated entities. It cannot be inferred from the associations established by the evidence of record that the petitioner and its 24 employees are being “operated by” the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics. Accordingly, the claimed affiliation or relationship with the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics does not satisfy the second prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B).

Having made that determination, the AAO turns next to a consideration of whether the petitioner has established that it is a related or affiliated nonprofit entity pursuant to the third prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B): that it is attached to an institution of higher education as a member, branch, cooperative, or subsidiary. In the supplementary information to the interim regulation now found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(19)(iii)(B), the legacy INS stated that it drafted the regulation “drawing on generally accepted definitions” of the terms. 63 Fed. Reg. 65657, 65658 (Nov. 30, 1998).

It is evident from the foregoing discussion of the evidence that the petitioner, a private school, when viewed as a single entity, is not attached to an institution of higher education in a manner consistent with these terms. There is no indication whatsoever from the evidence submitted that the petitioner is a member, branch, cooperative, or subsidiary of the University of the Virgin Islands, Division of Science and Mathematics. All four of these terms indicate, at a bare minimum, some type of shared ownership and/or control, which has not been presented in this matter. *See generally Black's Law Dictionary* at 182, 336, 1442 (7th Ed. 1999)(defining the terms branch, cooperative, and subsidiary); *see also Webster's New College Dictionary* at 699 (3rd ed. 2008)(defining the term “member”).

Based on the evidence of record as currently constituted, the AAO finds that the petitioner has failed to establish that it is an affiliated or related nonprofit entity pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214(h)(19)(iii)(B).

### III. Conclusion.

Upon review, the petitioner has not established that it is exempt from the FY08 H-1B cap pursuant to section 214(g)(5) of the Act. **Accordingly, the petition must be denied.** The AAO notes, however, that the fiscal year 2010 allocation of H-1B visas has not been exhausted as of the date of this decision. This decision shall not serve to bar the petitioner from re-filing a new petition with a start date subsequent to October 1, 2009, accompanied by evidence to show eligibility under the technical requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

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