



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: **SEP 25 2014**

OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,


Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

On the Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129), the petitioner describes itself as a technical and business solutions provider and information technology services business established in [REDACTED]. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a programmer analyst position, the petitioner seeks to classify him 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, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the director's basis for denial of the petition was erroneous and contends that the petitioner satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

The record of proceeding before us contains: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) counsel's response to the director's RFE; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, and supporting documentation. We reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing our decision.

For the reasons that will be discussed below, we agree with the director that the petitioner has failed to establish eligibility for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director's decision will not be disturbed. The appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In the petition, the petitioner indicated that it is seeking the beneficiary's services as a programmer analyst on a full-time basis. In addition, the petitioner indicated that the beneficiary will work at [REDACTED].

In the letter of support, the petitioner stated that "the Beneficiary will be working on a project for our company off-site at the end client location of [REDACTED] located at [REDACTED]. In addition, the petitioner provided the beneficiary's duties and responsibilities in the proffered position.

The petitioner also stated that "a Bachelor's degree in computer science or an equivalent discipline which requires complex logical analysis (such as engineering, statistics, mathematics or related fields), is an educational requirement" for the proffered position.

With the initial petition, the petitioner submitted a copy of the beneficiary's foreign academic credentials, however, the petitioner did not submit an educational evaluation of the beneficiary's foreign academic credentials.

In addition, the petitioner submitted a Labor Condition Application (LCA) in support of the instant

H-1B petition. The petitioner indicated that the occupational classification for the proffered position is "Computer Programmers" – SOC (ONET/OES Code) 15-1131, at a Level I (entry level) wage. The beneficiary's places of employment are listed as [REDACTED]

¹

In further support of the petition, the petitioner submitted: (1) a document entitled "Project Information & Itinerary of Services"; (2) a letter from [REDACTED] Applications Manager for [REDACTED] dated March 26, 2013; (3) a Master Consulting and Programming Services Agreement, along with a Statement of Work (SOW), between the petitioner and [REDACTED] dated August 11, 2011;² (4) an offer of employment letter, executed on March 22, 2013, along with an addendum; (5) organizational charts; (6) the petitioner's slides regarding its "Management Presentation"; (7) printouts from the petitioner's website; and (8) a printout regarding the petitioner's benefits.

Upon review of the documentation, the director found the evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued an RFE. The director outlined the specific evidence to be submitted.

Counsel responded by submitting additional evidence. Specifically, counsel submitted: (1) an SOW between the petitioner and [REDACTED] dated September 30, 2013; (2) a letter from [REDACTED] Application Manager for [REDACTED] dated November 22, 2013; (3) printouts from [REDACTED] website; (4) a revised "Project Information & Itinerary of Services" document; (5) copies of the petitioner's postings for the programmer analyst position; and (6)

¹ In the letter of support, the petitioner stated that the LCA "submitted herein identifies the end-client work location along with our corporate address, although it is anticipated that the beneficiary will be committed to working on the end-client project through the duration of the LCA period." It must be noted that the instructions to the LCA (ETA Form 9035 & 9035E) state the following:

It is important for the employer to define the place of intended employment with as much geographic specificity as possible. The place of employment address listed . . . must be a physical location and cannot be a P.O. Box. The employer may use this section to identify up to three (3) physical locations and corresponding prevailing wages covering each location where work will be performed and the electronic system will accept up to 3 physical locations and prevailing wage information.

Thus, the instructions require that the employer list the place of intended employment "with as much geographic specificity as possible" and, further notes that the employer may identify up to three physical locations, including street address, city, county, state, and zip code, where work will be performed. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) regulations state that "[e]ach LCA *shall state . . . [t]he places of intended employment.*" 20 C.F.R. § 655.730(c)(4) (emphasis added).

Further, with certain limited exceptions, the applicable DOL regulations define the term "place of employment" as the worksite or physical location where the work actually is performed by the H-1B nonimmigrant. See 20 C.F.R. § 655.715.

² We observe that the petitioner did not submit all of the pages of the agreement and SOW. No explanation for failing to provide the entire document was provided.

job vacancy announcements.

The director reviewed the record of proceeding and determined that the petitioner failed to establish eligibility for the benefit sought. The director denied the petition on January 24, 2014. Counsel submitted an appeal of the denial of the H-1B petition. With the appeal brief, counsel submits new evidence.³

II. ISSUE NOT ADDRESSED BY THE DIRECTOR'S DECISION

Employer-Employee Relationship with the Beneficiary

We reviewed the record of proceeding in its entirety. As a preliminary matter, we will discuss an issue, beyond the decision of the director that precludes the approval of the petition.⁴ We find that the petitioner has not established that it meets the regulatory definition of a United States employer. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). More specifically, the petitioner has not established that it will have "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." *Id.*

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act defines an H-1B nonimmigrant in pertinent part as an alien:

subject to section 212(j)(2), who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services . . . in a specialty occupation described in section 214(i)(1) . . . , who meets the requirements for the occupation specified in section 214(i)(2) . . . , and with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the [Secretary of Homeland Security] that the intending employer has filed with the Secretary [of Labor] an application under section 212(n)(1)

The term "United States employer" is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 8 C.F.R.

³ With regard to the new documentation submitted on appeal that was encompassed by the director's RFE, we note that this evidence is outside the scope of the appeal. The regulations indicate that the petitioner shall submit additional evidence as the director, in his or her discretion, may deem necessary in the adjudication of the petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8); 214.2(h)(9)(i). The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (8), and (12). The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

Where, as here, a petitioner has been put on notice of a deficiency in the evidence and has been given an opportunity to respond to that deficiency, we will not accept evidence offered for the first time on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *see also Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533. If the petitioner had wanted the submitted evidence to be considered, it should have submitted it with the initial petition or in response to the director's request for evidence. *Id.* The petitioner has not provided a valid reason for not previously submitting the evidence. Under the circumstances, we need not consider the sufficiency of such evidence requested by the director in the RFE but submitted for the first time on appeal.

⁴ We conduct appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

§ 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as follows:

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.

The record is not persuasive in establishing that the petitioner will have an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary.

Although "United States employer" is defined in the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), it is noted that the terms "employee" and "employer-employee relationship" are not defined for purposes of the H-1B visa classification. Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act indicates that an alien coming to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation will have an "intending employer" who will file an LCA with the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 212(n)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1) (2012). The intending employer is described as offering full-time or part-time "employment" to the H-1B "employee." Subsections 212(n)(1)(A)(i) and 212(n)(2)(C)(vii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1)(A)(i), (2)(C)(vii) (2012). Further, the regulations indicate that "United States employers" must file a Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129) in order to classify aliens as H-1B temporary "employees." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1), (2)(i)(A). Finally, the definition of "United States employer" indicates in its second prong that the petitioner must have an "employer-employee relationship" with the "employees under this part," i.e., the H-1B beneficiary, and that this relationship be evidenced by the employer's ability to "hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of any such employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "United States employer").

Neither the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service ("INS") nor U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) defined the terms "employee" or "employer-employee relationship" by regulation for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, even though the regulation describes H-1B beneficiaries as being "employees" who must have an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer." *Id.* Therefore, for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, these terms are undefined.

The United States Supreme Court has determined that where federal law fails to clearly define the term "employee," courts should conclude that the term was "intended to describe the conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine." *Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. v. Darden*, 503 U.S. 318, 322-323 (1992) (hereinafter "*Darden*") (quoting *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. 730 (1989)). The Supreme Court stated:

"In determining whether a hired party is an employee under the general common law of

agency, we consider the hiring party's right to control the manner and means by which the product is accomplished. Among the other factors relevant to this inquiry are the skill required; the source of the instrumentalities and tools; the location of the work; the duration of the relationship between the parties; whether the hiring party has the right to assign additional projects to the hired party; the extent of the hired party's discretion over when and how long to work; the method of payment; the hired party's role in hiring and paying assistants; whether the work is part of the regular business of the hiring party; whether the hiring party is in business; the provision of employee benefits; and the tax treatment of the hired party."

Darden, 503 U.S. at 323-324 (quoting *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. at 751-752); see also *Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates, P.C. v. Wells*, 538 U.S. 440, 445 (2003) (hereinafter "*Clackamas*"). As the common-law test contains "no shorthand formula or magic phrase that can be applied to find the answer, . . . all of the incidents of the relationship must be assessed and weighed with no one factor being decisive." *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324 (quoting *NLRB v. United Ins. Co. of America*, 390 U.S. 254, 258 (1968)).

In this matter, the Act does not exhibit a legislative intent to extend the definition of "employer" in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, "employment" in section 212(n)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, or "employee" in section 212(n)(2)(C)(vii) of the Act beyond the traditional common law definitions. See generally 136 Cong. Rec. S17106 (daily ed. Oct. 26, 1990); 136 Cong. Rec. H12358 (daily ed. Oct. 27, 1990). On the contrary, in the context of the H-1B visa classification, the regulations define the term "United States employer" to be even more restrictive than the common law agency definition.⁵

⁵ While the *Darden* court considered only the definition of "employee" under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(6), and did not address the definition of "employer," courts have generally refused to extend the common law agency definition to ERISA's use of employer because "the definition of 'employer' in ERISA, unlike the definition of 'employee,' clearly indicates legislative intent to extend the definition beyond the traditional common law definition." See, e.g., *Bowers v. Andrew Weir Shipping, Ltd.*, 810 F. Supp. 522 (S.D.N.Y. 1992), *aff'd*, 27 F.3d 800 (2nd Cir.), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1000 (1994).

However, in this matter, the Act does not exhibit a legislative intent to extend the definition of "employer" in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, "employment" in section 212(n)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, or "employee" in section 212(n)(2)(C)(vii) of the Act beyond the traditional common law definitions. Instead, in the context of the H-1B visa classification, the term "United States employer" was defined in the regulations to be even more restrictive than the common law agency definition. A federal agency's interpretation of a statute whose administration is entrusted to it is to be accepted unless Congress has spoken directly on the issue. See *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 844-845 (1984).

The regulatory definition of "United States employer" requires H-1B employers to have a tax identification number, to employ persons in the United States, and to have an "employer-employee relationship" with the H-1B "employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Accordingly, the term "United States employer" not only requires H-1B employers and employees to have an "employer-employee relationship" as understood by common-law agency doctrine, it imposes additional requirements of having a tax identification number and to employ persons in the United States. The lack of an express expansion of the definition regarding the terms "employee," "employed," "employment" or "employer-employee relationship" indicates that the regulations do not intend to

Specifically, the regulatory definition of "United States employer" requires H-1B employers to have a tax identification number, to engage a person to work within the United States, and to have an "employer-employee relationship" with the H-1B "employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Accordingly, the term "United States employer" not only requires H-1B employers and employees to have an "employer-employee relationship" as understood by common-law agency doctrine, it imposes additional requirements of having a tax identification number and to employ persons in the United States. The lack of an express expansion of the definition regarding the terms "employee" or "employer-employee relationship" combined with the agency's otherwise generally circular definition of United States employer in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) indicates that the regulations do not intend to extend the definition beyond "the traditional common law definition" or, more importantly, that construing these terms in this manner would thwart congressional design or lead to absurd results. *Cf. Darden*, 503 U.S. at 318-319.⁶

Accordingly, in the absence of an express congressional intent to impose broader definitions, both the "conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine" and the *Darden* construction test apply to the terms "employee" and "employer-employee relationship" as used in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, section 212(n) of the Act, and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h).⁷

Therefore, in considering whether or not one will be an "employee" in an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer" for purposes of H-1B nonimmigrant petitions, USCIS must focus on the common-law touchstone of "control." *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450; *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining a "United States employer" as one who "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" (emphasis added)).

extend the definition beyond "the traditional common law definition." Therefore, in the absence of an intent to impose broader definitions by either Congress or USCIS, the "conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine," and the *Darden* construction test, apply to the terms "employee," "employer-employee relationship," "employed," and "employment" as used in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, section 212(n) of the Act, and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h). That being said, there are instances in the Act where Congress may have intended a broader application of the term "employer" than what is encompassed in the conventional master-servant relationship. *See, e.g.,* section 214(c)(2)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(c)(2)(F) (referring to "unaffiliated employers" supervising and controlling L-1B intracompany transferees having specialized knowledge); section 274A of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1324a (referring to the employment of unauthorized aliens).

⁶ To the extent the regulations are ambiguous with regard to the terms "employee" or "employer-employee relationship," the agency's interpretation of these terms should be found to be controlling unless "plainly erroneous or inconsistent with the regulation." *Auer v. Robbins*, 519 U.S. 452, 461 (1997) (citing *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 359, 109 S.Ct. 1835, 1850, 104 L.Ed.2d 351 (1989) (quoting *Bowles v. Seminole Rock & Sand Co.*, 325 U.S. 410, 414, 65 S.Ct. 1215, 1217, 89 L.Ed. 1700 (1945))).

⁷ That said, there are instances in the Act where Congress may have intended a broader application of the term "employer" than what is encompassed in the conventional master-servant relationship. *See, e.g.,* section 214(c)(2)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(c)(2)(F) (referring to "unaffiliated employers" supervising and controlling L-1B intracompany transferees having specialized knowledge); section 274A of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1324a (referring to the employment of unauthorized aliens).

The factors indicating that a worker is or will be an "employee" of an "employer" are clearly delineated in both the *Darden* and *Clackamas* decisions. *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 323-324; *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 445; see also *Restatement (Second) of Agency* § 220(2) (1958). Such indicia of control include when, where, and how a worker performs the job; the continuity of the worker's relationship with the employer; the tax treatment of the worker; the provision of employee benefits; and whether the work performed by the worker is part of the employer's regular business. See *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 445; see also *New Compliance Manual*, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, § 2-III(A)(1) (adopting a materially identical test and indicating that said test was based on the *Darden* decision); see also *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 388 (5th Cir. 2000) (determining that hospitals, as the recipients of beneficiaries' services, are the "true employers" of H-1B nurses under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h), even though a medical contract service agency is the actual petitioner, because the hospitals ultimately hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiaries).

It is important to note, however, that the factors listed in *Darden* and *Clackamas* are not exhaustive and must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Other aspects of the relationship between the parties relevant to control may affect the determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists. Further, not all or even a majority of the listed criteria need be met; however, the fact finder must weigh and compare a combination of the factors in analyzing the facts of each individual case. The determination must be based on all of the circumstances in the relationship between the parties, regardless of whether the parties refer to it as an employee or as an independent contractor relationship. See *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; *New Compliance Manual* at § 2-III(A)(1).

Furthermore, when examining the factors relevant to determining control, USCIS must assess and weigh each actual factor itself as it exists or will exist and not the claimed employer's right to influence or change that factor, unless specifically provided for by the common-law test. See *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 323-324. For example, while the assignment of additional projects is dependent on who has the *right* to assign them, it is the *actual* source of the instrumentalities and tools that must be examined, not who has the *right* to provide the tools required to complete an assigned project. See *id.* at 323. Lastly, the "mere existence of a document styled 'employment agreement'" shall not lead inexorably to the conclusion that the worker is an employee. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. "Rather, . . . the answer to whether [an individual] is an employee depends on 'all of the incidents of the relationship . . . with no one factor being decisive.'" *Id.* at 451 (quoting *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324).

Applying the *Darden* and *Clackamas* tests to this matter, the petitioner has not established that it will be a "United States employer" having an "employer-employee relationship" with the beneficiary as an H-1B temporary "employee."

In the letter of support, the petitioner states that "[w]e, as the employer, have exclusive control over the administrative and HR matters in addition to all matters relating to work assignments, salary, health benefits, insurance, performance reviews and all incidentals." The petitioner also submitted a printout regarding its benefits summary. We acknowledge that the method of payment of wages can be a pertinent factor in determining the petitioner's relationship with the beneficiary. However, while items such as wages, contributions, federal and state income tax withholdings, and other benefits are relevant factors in determining who will control an alien beneficiary, other incidents of the relationship, e.g., where will the work be located, who will provide the instrumentalities and tools, who will oversee and

direct the work of the beneficiary, and who has the right or ability to affect the projects to which the alien beneficiary is assigned, must also be assessed and weighed in order to make a determination as to who will be the beneficiary's employer.

With the initial petition, the petitioner provided an offer of employment letter, along with an addendum, for the beneficiary that was executed on March 22, 2013. Notably, the addendum to the offer of employment letter states that the beneficiary will "perform the following PROJECT duties assigned to [the beneficiary] at the company location or at customer locations." According to the addendum, the beneficiary may be placed at various locations and not necessarily at its office location or in [REDACTED], Alabama as indicated on the Form I-129 and LCA. In addition, we observe that the requirements for the position in the addendum are different from the requirements provided in the letter of support. While an offer of employment letter may provide some insight into the relationship of a petitioner and a beneficiary, it must be noted again that the "mere existence of a document styled 'employment agreement'" shall not lead inexorably to the conclusion that the worker is an employee. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450.

As previously noted, when making a determination of whether the petitioner has established that it has or will have an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary, we look at a number of factors, including who will provide the instrumentalities and tools required to perform the specialty occupation. In the instant case, the director specifically noted this factor in the RFE. Moreover, the director provided examples of evidence for the petitioner to submit to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, which included documentation regarding the source of the instrumentalities and tools needed to perform the job. However, upon review of the record of proceeding, the petitioner did not provide any information on this matter. Here, the petitioner was given an opportunity to clarify the source of instrumentalities and tools to be used by the beneficiary, but it failed to address or submit any probative evidence on the issue.

Moreover, through the RFE, the director provided the petitioner an opportunity to submit documentation regarding the beneficiary's role in hiring and paying assistants. In the instant case, the petitioner did not address this issue or provide any documentation regarding the beneficiary's role in hiring and paying assistants.

In addition, through the RFE, the director provided the petitioner an opportunity to address the tax treatment of the beneficiary. However, the petitioner did not provide any information on this issue.

Further, the petitioner has not established the duration of the relationship between the parties. More specifically, on the Form I-129, the petitioner requested that the beneficiary be granted H-1B classification from October 1, 2013 to September 14, 2016. In the supporting documentation, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary will work at [REDACTED]

With the initial petition, the petitioner also submitted a Master Consulting and Programming Services Agreement between the petitioner and [REDACTED] dated August 11, 2011. The agreement is signed by [REDACTED] CEO for the petitioning company, and [REDACTED] Manager, Systems and Programming for [REDACTED]. The agreement states, "The parties hereto agree that this Agreement shall continue until such time as [the petitioner] has completed performing Services and providing Deliverables as specified in Exhibit 'A' hereto, as

such shall from time to time exist_or in subsequent SOWs." Notably, the petitioner did not provide the Exhibit A referenced in the agreement.

In addition, the petitioner submitted an SOW between itself and [REDACTED], dated August 11, 2011. Notably, the SOW is not signed by the petitioner or [REDACTED]. The SOW states that "[t]his SOW will be effective for a period starting August 11, 2011 and ending on the earlier to occur of (i) August 11, 2014 and (ii) the date of termination of the Master Services Agreement." We observe that neither the beneficiary nor the proffered position is listed in the SOW. Therefore, the SOW does not provide any specific information establishing the beneficiary's place of employment or the duration of the beneficiary's work.

In response to the director's RFE, counsel provided a second SOW, however, it was executed after the director's RFE and thus does not pre-date the filing of the petition. The petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1). 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'r 1978).

The petitioner and counsel also submitted two letters from [REDACTED]. In both letters, Mr. [REDACTED] claims that the project will last through 2015, with possible extensions. We note that the petitioner has not provided any probative evidence to demonstrate that the project has been extended beyond 2015.

The petitioner did not submit any further evidence establishing any additional projects or specific work for the beneficiary. The petitioner requested the beneficiary be granted H-1B classification from October 1, 2013, to September 14, 2016. However, the first SOW indicates that the [REDACTED] project will end prior to the beneficiary's requested employment start date. Although the two letters signed by Mr. [REDACTED] claims that the project will last through 2015, with possible extensions, the record does not include credible evidence of such extension. Thus, the petitioner has not provided probative evidence to establish that it has work for the beneficiary from October 1, 2013, to September 14, 2016. The record does not demonstrate that the petitioner will maintain an employer-employee relationship for the duration of the validity of the requested period.

Further, a key element in this matter is who would have the ability to hire, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiary for the duration of the H-1B petition. In that regard it must be noted that the record indicates that the beneficiary will be physically located at [REDACTED] Alabama. The petitioner is located approximately 698 miles away in [REDACTED] Illinois.

Notably, Mr. [REDACTED] states in his March 26, 2013 letter that the beneficiary "reports to [the petitioner's] onsite Manager [REDACTED]" However, in his November 22, 2013 letter, Mr. [REDACTED] states that the beneficiary "will work under the supervision of [the petitioner's] Manager, [REDACTED] at all times." No explanation for the variance was provided by the petitioner or Mr. [REDACTED]. Moreover, there is a lack of probative evidence establishing that either of the petitioner's claimed onsite managers would exercise direct control over the beneficiary's daily duties. We observe that in the RFE, the director specifically requested that the petitioner provide documentation to clarify the petitioner's

employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary. The director provided a list of the types of evidence to be submitted, which included a request that the petitioner provide such documentation as a brief description of who will supervise the beneficiary, along with the person's duties and/or other similarly probative documents. However, the petitioner failed to provide specific information regarding the beneficiary's supervisor (e.g., brief description of job duties, location).

Upon complete review of the record of proceeding, we find that the evidence in this matter is insufficient to establish that the petitioner qualifies as a United States employer, as defined by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). The evidence of record does not establish that the petitioner would act as the beneficiary's employer. Despite the director's specific request for evidence on this issue, the petitioner failed to submit sufficient evidence to corroborate its claim. The non-existence or other unavailability of required evidence creates a presumption of ineligibility. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(2)(i). Based on the tests outlined above, the petitioner has not established that it will be a "United States employer" having an "employer-employee relationship" with the beneficiary as an H-1B temporary "employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

There is a lack of probative evidence to support the petitioner's assertions. It cannot be concluded, therefore, that the petitioner has satisfied its burden and established that it qualifies as a United States employer with standing to file the instant petition in this matter. See section 214(c)(1) of the Act (requiring an "Importing Employer"); 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(A) (stating that the "United States employer . . . must file" the petition); 56 Fed. Reg. 61111, 61112 (Dec. 2, 1991) (explaining that only "United States employers can file an H-1B petition" and adding the definition of that term at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as clarification). Accordingly, the petition cannot be approved, and the appeal must be dismissed.

III. REVIEW OF THE DIRECTOR'S DECISION

Specialty Occupation

We will now address the director's basis for denial of the petition, namely that the petitioner failed to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. For an H-1B petition to be granted, the petitioner must provide sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

Section 214(i)(1) of 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.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) states, in pertinent part, the following:

Specialty occupation means an occupation which [(1)] requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields 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 [(2)] 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, a proposed position must also 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.

As a threshold issue, it is noted that 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must logically be read together with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). In other words, this regulatory language must be construed in harmony with the thrust of the related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *See K Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996). As such, the criteria stated in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) should logically be read as being necessary but not necessarily sufficient to meet the statutory and regulatory definition of specialty occupation. To otherwise interpret this section as stating the necessary *and* sufficient conditions for meeting the definition of specialty occupation would result in particular positions meeting a condition under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) but not the statutory or regulatory definition. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 387. To avoid this result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as providing supplemental criteria that must be met in accordance with, and not as alternatives to, the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

As such and consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), USCIS consistently interprets the term "degree" in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific

specialty that is directly related to the proffered position. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007) (describing "a degree requirement in a specific specialty" as "one that relates directly to the duties and responsibilities of a particular position"). Applying this standard, USCIS regularly approves H-1B petitions for qualified aliens who are to be employed as engineers, computer scientists, certified public accountants, college professors, and other such occupations. These professions, for which petitioners have regularly been able to establish a minimum entry requirement in the United States of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position, fairly represent the types of specialty occupations that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

The petitioner asserted that the beneficiary would be employed as a programmer analyst. However, to determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, USCIS does not simply rely on a position's title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations, are factors to be considered. USCIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384. The critical element is not the title of the position nor an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty, or its equivalent, as the minimum for entry into the occupation, as required by the Act.

Here, the petitioner has provided inconsistent information regarding the educational requirement for the proffered position.

- Specifically, in letter of support, the petitioner stated that the position required "a Bachelor's degree in computer science or an equivalent discipline which requires complex logic analysis (such as engineering, statistics, mathematics or related fields)."
- However, in the addendum to the offer letter, the petitioner asserted that the proffered position "requires a minimum of [a] 4-year bachelor degree in computer science, or any related field of engineering – the degree or combination of education should be equivalent to a 4-year U.S. bachelor degree in computer science, or any related field of engineering."
- In addition, the petitioner provided a letter from [REDACTED] which stated that the position requires "a bachelor's degree or higher in the field of specialty (or its equivalent)."
- The petitioner also submitted postings for the position of programmer analyst, which stated that a "Master's degree or equivalent (as evaluated by a credential evaluation service) in Computer Science or Computer Applications plus two year

[of] experience in these job duties/technologies" is required.⁸

- Further, the petitioner submitted postings, which stated that a "Bachelor's degree or equivalent in Computer Science or Electronics Engineering plus five years [of] progressive experience" is required for the programmer analyst position.
- On appeal, counsel claims that the proffered position requires "at least a baccalaureate degree in computers or related field."

No explanation for the variances in the petitioner's claimed requirements was provided. 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).

Further, it must be noted that the petitioner's requirements are inadequate to establish that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation. In general, provided the specialties are closely related, e.g., chemistry and biochemistry, a minimum of a bachelor's or higher degree in more than one specialty is recognized as satisfying the "degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent)" requirement of section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act. In such a case, the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" would essentially be the same. Since there must be a close correlation between the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" and the position, however, a minimum entry requirement of a degree in two disparate fields, such as philosophy and engineering, for example, would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be "in *the* specific specialty (or its equivalent)," unless the petitioner establishes how each field is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position such that the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" is essentially an amalgamation of these different specialties. Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added).

In other words, while the statutory "the" and the regulatory "a" both denote a singular "specialty," we do not so narrowly interpret these provisions to exclude positions from qualifying as specialty occupations if they permit, as a minimum entry requirement, degrees in more than one closely related specialty. See section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). This also includes even seemingly disparate specialties providing, again, the evidence of record establishes how each acceptable, specific field of study is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position.

⁸ We observe that one of the postings indicate a salary of \$75,171 per year. On the Form I-129 and LCA, the petitioner indicated the beneficiary's salary as \$65,000 per year. No explanation for the discrepancy was provided. Moreover, according to section 212(n)(1) of the Act, an employer must attest that it will pay a holder of an H-1B visa the higher of the prevailing wage in the "area of employment" or the amount paid to other employees with similar experience and qualifications who are performing the same services. See *Patel v. Boghra*, 369 Fed.Appx. 722, 723 (7th Cir. 2010).

Here, the petitioner states that its minimum educational requirement for the proffered position is a bachelor's degree in computer science, engineering, statistics, mathematics, computer applications, electronics engineering and/or computers. The issue is that these fields cover numerous and various specialties. The petitioner, who bears the burden of proof in this proceeding, fails to establish either that these various degrees are all closely related fields or that a general degree in one of these fields is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position proffered in this matter. Accordingly, as the evidence of record fails to establish a standard, minimum requirement of at least a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty*, or its equivalent, for entry into the particular position, it does not support the proffered position as being a specialty occupation and, in fact, supports the opposite conclusion.

Further, as recognized by the court in *Defensor, supra*, where the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner, evidence of the client companies' job requirements is critical. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d at 387-388. The court held that the former Immigration and Naturalization Service had reasonably interpreted the statute and regulations as requiring the petitioner to produce evidence that a proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation on the basis of the requirements imposed by the entities using the beneficiary's services. *Id.* at 384. Such evidence must be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate the type and educational level of highly specialized knowledge in a specific discipline that is necessary to perform that particular work.

As mentioned, the petitioner submitted two letters from [REDACTED] who works for the end client, [REDACTED]. In the letter dated March 26, 2013, Mr. [REDACTED] provided a list of the beneficiary's duties. Further, in the letter dated November 22, 2013, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that the position requires "a bachelor's degree or higher in the field of specialty (or its equivalent)." However, the client does not state a requirement for a degree in a specific specialty. We here reiterate that the degree requirement set by the statutory and regulatory framework of the H-1B program is not just a bachelor's or higher degree, but such a degree in a *specific specialty* that is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the position. *See* 214(i)(1)(b) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

While the petitioner has identified its proffered position as that of a programmer analyst, and attested the position falls within the occupational category of computer programmers on the LCA, the descriptions of the beneficiary's duties, as provided by the petitioner and the client, lack the specificity and detail necessary to support the petitioner's contention that the position is a specialty occupation. While a generalized description may be appropriate when defining the range of duties that are performed within an occupation, such generic descriptions cannot be relied upon by the petitioner when discussing the duties attached to a specific employment for H-1B approval. In establishing such a position as a specialty occupation, especially one that may be classified as a staffing position or labor-for-hire, the description of the proffered position must include sufficient details to substantiate that the petitioner has H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary.⁹ Here, the job description fails to communicate (1) the actual work that the beneficiary would perform on a day-to-day basis; (2) the complexity, uniqueness and/or specialization of the tasks; and/or (3) the correlation between that work

⁹ We observe, for example, that the petitioner's initial overview of the position does not correspond with any specificity to the duties generally described in either statement of work submitted. Accordingly, it is not clear what the beneficiary will be doing on a daily basis.

and a need for a particular level education of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty.

The failure to establish the substantive nature of the work to be performed by the beneficiary precludes a finding that the proffered position satisfies any criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), because it is the substantive nature of that work that determines (1) the normal minimum educational requirement for the particular position, which is the focus of criterion 1; (2) industry positions which are parallel to the proffered position and thus appropriate for review for a common degree requirement, under the first alternate prong of criterion 2;¹⁰ (3) the level of complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position, which is the focus of the second alternate prong of criterion 2; (4) the factual justification for a petitioner normally requiring a degree or its equivalent, when that is an issue under criterion 3; and (5) the degree of specialization and complexity of the specific duties, which is the focus of criterion 4.

Accordingly, as the petitioner has not established that it has satisfied any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it cannot be found that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. For this reason, the appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied.

IV. BENEFICIARY QUALIFICATIONS

We do not need to examine the issue of the beneficiary's qualifications, because the petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. In other words, the beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation.

As discussed in this decision, the petitioner did not submit sufficient evidence regarding the proffered position to determine whether it will require a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Absent this determination that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform the duties of the proffered position, it also cannot be determined whether the beneficiary possesses that degree, or its equivalent. Therefore, we need not

¹⁰ In response to the director's RFE, counsel for the petitioner submitted several job postings from various companies for various computer analyst positions. As the petitioner and the client have not provided a substantive description of the actual duties to be performed in the proffered position, it is not possible to ascertain whether the job advertisements are for parallel positions. Moreover, the petitioner did not provide any independent evidence of how representative these job advertisements are of the particular advertising employers' recruiting history for the type of jobs advertised. Further, as they are only solicitations for hire, they are not evidence of the employers' actual hiring practices. Furthermore, the petitioner fails to establish the relevancy of the provided examples to the issue here. That is, the petitioner has not demonstrated what statistically valid inferences, if any, can be drawn from these advertisements with regard to determining the common educational requirements for entry into parallel positions in similar organizations. *See generally* Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research* 186-228 (1995). Moreover, given that there is no indication that the advertisements were randomly selected, the validity of any such inferences could not be accurately determined even if the sampling unit were sufficiently large. *See id.* at 195-196 (explaining that "[r]andom selection is the key to [the] process [of probability sampling]" and that "random selection offers access to the body of probability theory, which provides the basis for estimates of population parameters and estimates of error"). Accordingly, the advertisements will not be further reviewed or discussed as the petitioner has not established the relevance of the advertisements here.

and will not address the beneficiary's qualifications further, except to note that, in any event, the petitioner did not submit an evaluation of the beneficiary's foreign degree or sufficient evidence to establish that his degree is the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree in a specific specialty. As such, since evidence was not presented that the beneficiary has at least a U.S. bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, the petition could not be approved even if eligibility for the benefit sought had been otherwise established.

V. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by us even if the service center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 145 (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

Moreover, when we deny a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge only if it shows that we abused our discretion with respect to all of our enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1043, *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683.

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 128. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.