

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: LIN 05 162 50329 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 05 2006

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:

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 cursive script, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director 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 computer consulting and software development company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst. The petitioner 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 determined that the petitioner had not established that it qualified as a United States employer, or that it had available for the beneficiary a specialty occupation at the time the Form I-129 was filed, and accordingly denied the petition. On appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional information stating that the petitioner qualifies as an employer and that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), provides, in part, for the classification of qualified nonimmigrant aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation.

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 term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

[A]n occupation which 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 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 are 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 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.

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.

The evidence of record, including the subcontractor agreement and work order, 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.¹ See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). The director's decision to the contrary shall be withdrawn. Under the terms of a contract between the petitioner and GlobalTech Systems, Inc., the petitioner shall provide technical staffing services for GlobalTech. In providing those services, the petitioner will hire and retain all personnel necessary and sufficient to perform the services required. The petitioner will pay the beneficiary's salary and benefits, and maintain an employer/employee relationship with the beneficiary. The petitioner has the right to fire the beneficiary and is otherwise responsible for the work performed by the beneficiary on behalf of its client. The petitioner is responsible for all workers compensation, liability, health, and accident insurance on behalf of the beneficiary that is required by law and acts as an independent contractor in this agreement. The fact that the beneficiary will work at a third party location and is subject to that client's work rules and regulations does not change the employer/employee relationship existing between the petitioner and beneficiary. The petitioner will engage the beneficiary to work in the United States, has an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary, and has an Internal Revenue Service Tax identification number. The petitioner qualifies as a United States employer in this instance.

Pursuant to language at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B), employers must submit an itinerary with the dates and locations of employment if the beneficiary's duties will be performed in more than one location.

In his request for evidence, the director asked for the beneficiary's employment itinerary, listing the locations and organizations where the beneficiary will be providing services. In the Aytes memorandum cited at footnote 1, 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 contracts reflecting the dates and locations of employment. The itinerary submitted by the petitioner does not satisfy 8 C.F.R.

¹ 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).

§ 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) as it does not cover the entire period of the beneficiary's employment by the petitioner. As the petitioner has not complied with the requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B), the petition must be denied.²

In denying the petition, the director also found that the petitioner had not established that work in a specialty occupation was available for the beneficiary when the Form I-129 petition was filed. In addition to establishing that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), the petitioner must also demonstrate that the qualified nonimmigrant alien is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). The petitioner provided a copy of a contract between it and GlobalTech Systems, Inc., stating that the beneficiary would perform services as a programmer analyst pursuant to the terms of the agreement. The contract submitted was entered into on June 16, 2005, subsequent to the filing of the Form I-129 which was filed on May 20, 2005. The record does not establish that the petitioner had work in a specialty occupation available for the beneficiary as of May 20, 2005. The petitioner's unsupported statements to the contrary will not sustain its burden of proof. Simply going on the record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose 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 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Based upon the foregoing, the petition must be denied.

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to submit a job description from the entity for whom the beneficiary would be providing services, and that she could not determine that the position was a specialty occupation. The AAO agrees. The petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst. The Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, a resource upon which the AAO routinely relies to analyze the duties and educational requirements for a particular occupation, indicates that a worker may enter the occupation of programmer analyst without a baccalaureate degree in a specialty. Without a job description from the entity where the beneficiary will be performing duties as a programmer analyst, CIS cannot determine whether the position requires a four year degree in a specialty.

The evidence of record establishes that the petitioner is an employment contractor in that the petitioner will place the beneficiary at multiple work locations to perform services established by contractual agreements for third-party companies. The petitioner, however, has provided no contracts, work orders or statements of work describing the duties the beneficiary would perform for its clients and, therefore, has not established the proffered position as a specialty occupation.

The court in *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000) held that for the purpose of determining whether a proffered position is a specialty occupation, the petitioner acting as an employment contractor is merely a "token employer," while the entity for which the services are to be performed is the "more relevant employer." The *Defensor* court recognized that evidence of the client companies' job requirements is critical where the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner. The court held that the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service had reasonably interpreted the statute and regulations as requiring the

² As noted by Assistant Commissioner Aytes in the cited 1995 memorandum, "[t]he purpose of this particular regulation is to [e]nsure that alien beneficiaries accorded H status have an actual job offer and are not coming to the United States for speculative employment."

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.

As the record does not contain any documentation that establishes the specific duties the beneficiary would perform under contract for the petitioner's clients, the AAO cannot analyze whether these duties would require at least a baccalaureate degree or the equivalent in a specific specialty, as required for classification as a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation under any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(A) or that the beneficiary would be coming temporarily to the United States to perform the duties of a specialty occupation pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(B)(I).

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 and the appeal shall accordingly be dismissed.

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