

identity information is collected to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



D1

FILE: EAC 08 118 51862 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 19 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:

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.

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, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

  
Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed, as the matter is now moot.

The petitioner is an information technology company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a computer network administrator. 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 his determination that the petitioner had failed to establish: (1) that the petitioner had failed to submit a valid labor condition application; and (2) that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation.

A review of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records indicates that on July 16, 2008, a date subsequent to the denial of the instant petition, the petitioner submitted a new Form I-129 on behalf of the beneficiary. USCIS records indicate further that this second petition was approved on July 23, 2008, which granted the beneficiary H-1B status from July 23, 2008 until July 14, 2011. Because the beneficiary of the instant petition has been approved for employment with the petitioner based upon the filing of another petition, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed as moot.