

identifying data deleted 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

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D2



FILE: WAC 07 273 53155 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

JUL 09 2009

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.

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).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director of the California Service Center denied the nonimmigrant visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant petition seeking to employ the beneficiary in the position of principal consultant as an H-1B nonimmigrant 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 petitioner describes itself as an information technology consulting firm and indicates that it currently employs eight persons.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to establish that: (1) it meets the regulatory definition of an intending United States employer as defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii); (2) it meets the definition of “agent” at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F); (3) it submitted a valid labor condition application (LCA) for all locations; and (4) the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner submits a brief and additional evidence, and contends that the director erroneously found that the petitioner would not be the beneficiary’s employer.

In the September 1, 2007 letter of support, the petitioner stated that it is a “growing consulting firm that provides services to clients in analyzing data involving PeopleSoft software.”

The director found the initial evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued a request for evidence (RFE) on September 27, 2007. In the request, the director asked the petitioner to submit evidence demonstrating who the actual employer of the beneficiary would be. The director requested documentation such as contractual agreements or work orders from the actual end-client firm where the beneficiary would work. Additionally, the director noted that if the petitioner was acting as an agent, documentation such as an itinerary and a letter discussing the conditions of the employment from the end-client firms must be submitted.

In the response, counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner is the employer of the beneficiary. The petitioner submitted an “auxiliary supplier agreement,” between ZeroChaos, a Florida corporation, and the petitioner. The agreement is signed by the petitioner only. The agreement, under Section 1, states the following:

At ZeroChaos’ request, and upon Supplier’s [the petitioner] agreement, Supplier will assign its employees to Customer [the end-client] to perform services. At Customer or ZeroChaos’ request, Supplier shall execute and perform services in conformity with a Statement of Work (“SOW”), a Work Authorization (“WA”), a Purchase Order (“PO”), or other written or electronic form.

The petitioner also submitted a scope of work document, signed only by the petitioner, stating that the beneficiary will be placed at a jobsite from October 8, 2007 until September 30, 2008, located in Durham, North Carolina.

On October 29, 2007, the director denied the petition. The director found that the petitioner is a contractor that subcontracts workers with a variety of computer skills to other companies who need computer programming services. The director concluded that, because the petitioner was a contractor, it was required to submit the requested end contracts and itinerary and, without this documentation, the petitioner could not establish that it met the definition of United States employer or agent. The director also found that the petitioner failed to demonstrate the specific duties the beneficiary would perform under contract for the petitioner's clients and thus has not established that the duties of the proffered position for the beneficiary are those of a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the petitioner is the beneficiary's employer, or at least an agent for the beneficiary. Counsel states that the petitioner can "hire, fire, supervise, and control the work of the beneficiary." Counsel further states that "although it is true that [the petitioner] may send out the beneficiary to perform service for other companies, at the beginning and end of the day, the beneficiary reports to the agents of [the petitioner] and receives directions from agents of [the petitioner]."

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a statement of work between Kaiser Permanente [the customer] and the petitioner, signed by Kaiser Permanente only. The document states that the petitioner "shall provide PeopleSoft contracting resources per Customer requirements," and "customer shall provide oversight and management of contracting services and associated deliverables." The document lists the beneficiary as the contractor and indicates the project dates from July 2, 2007 until December 31, 2007, with a possible extension.

The petitioner submitted a second statement of work between Net Ratings, Inc. and the petitioner, signed only by Net Ratings, Inc. This document does not list the beneficiary.

In addition, the petitioner submitted a memorandum regarding "selection of [the beneficiary] for the position of Lead PeopleSoft Developer at Metlife." The memorandum states that IBM Global Business Services has secured a contract with MetLife "to assist with Data Conversion Coding and Analysis of India data into PeopleSoft HCM." It further states that IBM Global Business Services wishes to place the beneficiary in this project.

The first issue in the present matter is whether the petitioner has established that it meets the regulatory definition of a United States employer. Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Specifically, the AAO must determine whether the petitioner has established that it will have "an employee-employer 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." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii)(2).

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), defines H-1B nonimmigrants as an alien:

(i) who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services . . . in a specialty occupation described in section 1184(i)(1) . . ., who meets the requirements of the occupation specified in section 1184(i)(2) . . ., and with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines . . . that the intending employer has filed with the Secretary an application under 1182(n)(1).

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

Upon review, the AAO concurs with the director's decision. The record is not persuasive in establishing that the petitioner or any of its clients will have an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary.

Although "United States employer" is defined in the regulations, it is noted that "employee," "employed," "employment," and "employer-employee relationship" are not defined for purposes of the H-1B visa classification even though these terms are used repeatedly in both the Act and the regulations, including within the definition of "United States employer" at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). 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 a labor condition application with the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 212(n)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1). The intending employer is described as offering full-time or part-time "employment" to the H-1B "employee." Sections 212(n)(1)(A)(i) and 212(n)(2)(C)(vii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(n)(1)(A)(i) and 1182(n)(2)(C)(vii). Further, the regulations indicate that "United States employers" must file Form I-129 in order to classify aliens as H-1B temporary "employees." 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(1) and 214.2(h)(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"). Accordingly, neither the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) nor U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has defined the terms "employee," "employed," "employment," or "employer-employee relationship" by regulation for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, even though the law describes H-1B beneficiaries as being "employees" who must have an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer."¹ Therefore, for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, these terms are undefined.

The Supreme Court of the United States 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)). That definition is as follows:

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; see also *Restatement (Second) of Agency* § 220(2) (1958); *Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates, P.C. v. Wells*, 538 U.S. 440 (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*

¹ It is noted that, in certain limited circumstances, a petitioner might not necessarily be the "employer" of an H-1B beneficiary. Under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F), it is possible for an "agent" who will not be the actual "employer" of the H-1B temporary employee to file a petition on behalf of the actual employer and the beneficiary. However, the regulations clearly require H-1B beneficiaries of "agent" petitions to still be employed by "employers," who are required by regulation to have "employer-employee relationships" with respect to these H-1B "employees." See *id.*; 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(1) and 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "United States employer"). As such, the requirement that a beneficiary have a United States employer applies equally to single petitioning employers as well as multiple non-petitioning employers represented by "agents" under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F). The only difference is that the ultimate, non-petitioning employers of the H-1B employees in these scenarios do not directly file petitions.

Ins. Co. of America, 390 U.S. 254, 258 (1968).²

² 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. 1994), *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, 844-45 (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, thus indicating that the regulations do not indicate an intent to 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).

Finally, it is also noted that, if the statute and the regulations were somehow read as extending the definition of employee in the H-1B context beyond the traditional common law definition, this interpretation would likely thwart congressional design and lead to an absurd result when considering the \$750/\$1,500 fee imposed on H-1B employers under section 214(c)(9) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(c)(9). As 20 C.F.R. § 655.731(c)(10)(ii) mandates that no part of the fee imposed under section 214(c)(9) of the Act shall be paid, "directly or indirectly, voluntarily or involuntarily," by the beneficiary, it would not appear possible to comply with this provision in a situation in which the beneficiary is his or her own employer, especially where the requisite "control" over the beneficiary has not been established by the petitioner.

Therefore, in considering whether or not one is an "employee" in an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer" for purposes of H-1B nonimmigrant petitions, USCIS will focus on the common-law touchstone of control. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. Factors indicating that a worker is an "employee" of an "employer" are clearly delineated in both the *Darden* and *Clackamas* decisions. 503 U.S. at 323-324; *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 448-449; *cf. New Compliance Manual*, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, § 2-III(A)(1), (EEOC 2006) (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 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 may affect the determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists. Furthermore, 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).

Likewise, 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, as was true in applying common-law rules to the independent-contractor-versus-employee issue confronted in *Darden*, the answer to whether a shareholder-director 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 or any of its clients will be a "United States employer" having an "employer-employee relationship" with the beneficiary as an H-1B temporary "employee."

On appeal, the petitioner asserts that it is in fact the employer of the beneficiary and asserts that the director's conclusion to the contrary was erroneous. Specifically, the petitioner contends that it will retain the ability to hire, pay, fire, supervise and otherwise control the work of the beneficiary and therefore, it met its evidentiary burden. Additionally, it contends that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

To qualify as a United States employer, all three criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) must be met.

While the petitioner's letter of support indicated its engagement of the beneficiary to work in the United States, this documentation alone provides no details regarding the nature of the job offered or the location(s) where the services will be performed. Therefore, the petitioner has failed to establish that an employer-employee relationship exists.

Despite the director's specific request in the RFE that the petitioner provide contracts between the petitioner and the beneficiary, or between the petitioner and its end clients, the petitioner did not fully respond to the director's request. The regulations state that the petitioner shall submit additional evidence as the director, in his or her discretion, may deem necessary. 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)(8) and (12). 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).

The record reflects that the petitioner submitted documents in support of its claim that it was an employer for purposes of the definition above. Specifically, in the response to the director's request for evidence, the petitioner submitted an "auxiliary supplier agreement," between ZeroChaos, a Florida corporation, and the petitioner. The agreement is signed by the petitioner only. The agreement, under Section 1, states that "at ZeroChaos' request, and upon Supplier's [the petitioner] agreement, Supplier will assign its employees to Customers [the end-client] to perform services." The petitioner also submitted a scope of work document, signed only by the petitioner, stating that the beneficiary will be placed at a jobsite from October 8, 2007 until September 30, 2008, located in Durham, North Carolina. This document is not complete because it is not signed by both parties listed in the contract. In addition, the contract and scope of work do not provide a complete list of duties that the beneficiary will perform when working on this project. In addition, the project will end in September 30, 2008, however, the petitioner requested H-1B classification on behalf of the beneficiary until September 30, 2010.

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a statement of work, between Kaiser Permanente [the customer] and the petitioner, signed only by Kaiser Permanente. The document states that the petitioner "shall provide PeopleSoft contracting resources per Customer requirements," and "customer shall provide oversight and management of contracting services and associated deliverables." As specifically stated in the contract, the beneficiary will be placed at a client site and the "customer shall provide oversight and management of contracting services," and not the petitioner. In addition, the contract is not complete because it was only signed by one party, and the work project ends in December 31, 2007, only three months after filing the instant petition.

The petitioner submitted a second statement of work between Net Ratings, Inc. and the petitioner, signed only by Net Ratings, Inc. The statement of work does not list the duties to be performed for Net Ratings, Inc. and does not list the beneficiary in any part of the document.

In addition, the petitioner submitted a memorandum regarding “selection of [the beneficiary] for the position of Lead PeopleSoft Developer at MetLife.” The memorandum states that IBM Global Business Services has secured a contract with MetLife “to assist with Data Conversion Coding and Analysis of India data into PeopleSoft HCM.” It further states that IBM Global Business Services wishes to place the beneficiary in this project. Thus, it appears that the beneficiary will be placed in a project for an end-client. The petitioner did not submit proof that IBM Global Business Services has a contract with MetLife. In addition, the memorandum does not state the exact dates of the project, or duties the beneficiary will perform for the end-client.

The current information in the record is insufficient to show that a valid employment agreement or credible offer of employment existed between the petitioner and the beneficiary at the time the petition was filed. It has not been established that the beneficiary will be "controlled" by the petitioner or that the beneficiary's employment could be terminated. Absent evidence pertaining specifically to the requested validity period of this petition, the AAO is prohibited from concluding that the petitioner would be the beneficiary's employer. 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)).

Therefore, based on the tests outlined above, the petitioner has not established that it or any of its clients 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).

When discussing whether the petitioner was an agent, the director stated that the definition of agent at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F) provides for two types of agents: (1) “an agent performing the function of an employer”; and (2) “a company in the business as an agent involving multiple employers as the representative of both the employers and the beneficiary.” Counsel for the petitioner asserted that the petitioner was not an agent. The director found again that, absent documentation such as work orders or contracts between the ultimate end clients and the beneficiary, the petitioner could neither be considered an agent in this matter. As stated above, 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. at 165.

The next issue is whether the petitioner submitted a valid LCA for all work locations, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B).

While the Department of Labor (DOL) is the agency that certifies LCA applications before they are submitted to USCIS, the DOL regulations note that it is within the discretion of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (i.e., its immigration benefits branch, USCIS) to determine whether the content of an LCA filed for a particular Form I-129 actually supports that petition. See 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b), which states, in pertinent part:

For H-1B visas . . . DHS accepts the employer's petition (DHS Form I-129) with the DOL certified LCA attached. *In doing so, the DHS determines whether the*

petition is supported by an LCA which corresponds with the petition, whether the occupation named in the [LCA] is a specialty occupation or whether the individual is a fashion model of distinguished merit and ability, and whether the qualifications of the nonimmigrant meet the statutory requirements of H-1B visa classification. . . .

[Italics added]

The LCA listed the beneficiary's work location as Pleasanton, California. In reviewing the petitioner's supporting documentation, the director concluded that without ultimate end-client agreements, the actual work location(s) for the beneficiary could not be determined. Upon review, the AAO concurs with the director's finding. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner indicated that the beneficiary will perform services for other companies. Absent end-agreements with clients, the duration and location of work sites to which the beneficiary will be sent during the course of his employment cannot be determined. Absent this evidence, the AAO cannot conclude that the LCA submitted is valid for the beneficiary's intended work locations. For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

The final issue is whether the beneficiary will be employed in a specialty occupation.

It should be noted that for purposes of the H-1B adjudication, the issue of bona fide employment is viewed within the context of whether the petitioner has offered the beneficiary a position that is viewed as a specialty occupation. Of greater importance to this proceeding, therefore, is whether the petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to establish that the services to be performed by the beneficiary are those of a specialty occupation.

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 are 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, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), 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 384, 387 (5th Cir. 2000). To avoid this illogical and absurd result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as stating additional requirements that a position must meet, supplementing the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

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. 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 professions. These occupations all require a baccalaureate degree in the specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation and fairly represent the types of professions that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

In addressing whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation, the record is devoid of any documentary evidence as to where and for whom the beneficiary would be performing his services, and whether his services would be those of a programmer analyst.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv) provides that “[a]n H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation shall be accompanied by [d]ocumentation . . . or any other required evidence sufficient to establish . . . that the services the beneficiary is to perform are in a specialty occupation.” Moreover, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv)(A)(1) specifically lists contracts as one of the types of evidence that may be required to establish that the services to be performed by the beneficiary will be in a specialty occupation.

The petitioner’s letter of support, dated September 1, 2007, provided a vague overview of the beneficiary’s proposed duties. Specifically, the petitioner stated:

1. Provide support of existing PeopleSoft system and also help them upgrade PeopleSoft HRMS & Finance applications from version 8.3 to 8.9
2. Set-up PeopleSoft Administration & security
3. Provide application of patches, fixes to production, Tax updates and change requests
4. Provide data migration from development to acceptance and to production environments
5. Coordinate work with Oracle DBA & Unix Admin.
6. Provide execution of archiving scripts, data load scripts, Performance tuning of code as required
7. Be available to handle high severity calls, Functional & Technical Support/Research the issues/coordinate resolution for data fix and configuration changes
8. Monitor key interfaces, batch jobs, Extracts & resolve issues
9. Provide technical support coordination and resolution for data fixes and monitoring key interfaces

However, no independent documentation to further explain the nature and scope of these duties was submitted. As noted by counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner was engaged in an industry that typically outsourced its personnel to client sites to work on particular projects. Thus, the director requested documentation such as contracts and work orders, documentation that would outline for whom the beneficiary would render services and what his duties would include at each worksite. Despite the director’s specific request for these documents, the petitioner failed to comply.

As discussed above, the record contains simply the letter of support which outlines the proposed duties of the beneficiary but provides no information regarding the end-clients and their requirements for the beneficiary. Without evidence of contracts, work orders, or statements of work describing the duties the beneficiary would perform and for whom, the petitioner fails to establish that the duties that the beneficiary would perform are those of a specialty occupation.

Providing a generic job description that speculates what the beneficiary may or may not do at each worksite is insufficient. Again, simply going on 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. at 165.

In support of this analysis, USCIS routinely cites *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000), in which an examination of the ultimate employment of the beneficiary was deemed necessary to determine whether the position constitutes a specialty occupation. The petitioner in *Defensor*, Vintage Health Resources (Vintage), was a medical contract service agency that brought foreign nurses into the United States and located jobs for them at hospitals as registered nurses. The court in *Defensor* found that Vintage had “token degree requirements,” to “mask the fact that nursing in general is not a specialty occupation.” *Id.* at 387.

The court in *Defensor* 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.” *Id.* at 388. 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 *Defensor* court held that the legacy 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.* In *Defensor*, the court found that that evidence of the client companies’ job requirements is critical if the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner. *Id.*

In this matter, it is unclear whether the petitioner will be an employer or will act as an employment contractor. The job description provided by the petitioner, as well as various statements from the petitioner both prior to adjudication and on appeal, indicate that the beneficiary will be working on client projects and will be assigned to various clients worksites as necessary. Despite the director’s specific request for documentation to establish the ultimate location(s) of the beneficiary’s employment, the petitioner failed to comply prior to the adjudication of the petition. For example, despite a specific request for contracts identifying the beneficiary as a subcontractor, no such documentation was submitted. Moreover, the petitioner’s failure to provide evidence of an employer-employee relationship and/or work orders or employment contracts between the petitioner and its clients renders it impossible to conclude for whom the beneficiary will ultimately provide services and exactly what those services would entail. The AAO, therefore, cannot analyze whether the beneficiary’s duties at each worksite 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)(iii) 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)(1). For each of the reasons set forth above, the petition cannot be approved.

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The director's decision is affirmed. The petition is denied.