

**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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

D2



FILE: WAC 07 195 52932 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 02 2009

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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 project manager 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 services company and indicates that it currently employs 10 persons.

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

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner submits a brief and additional evidence in support of Form I-290B, and contends that the director erroneously found that the petitioner would not be the beneficiary’s employer.

The petitioner did not submit a cover letter when filing the I-129 petition. An employment letter addressed to the beneficiary and dated March 31, 2007 indicates that the petitioner is “a global IT enabled technology provider with core competencies in ERP application support, Network security support, world-leading dialer technologies, voice – TDM/IP solutions, collocation services, 24x7 Managed Services and On-Demand Hosting solution services for BPO marketplace and enterprises.” The letter further indicated that while the beneficiary would primarily be working at the company’s main office in Fargo, North Dakota, he may be assigned to other locations in the United States or abroad on a temporary or permanent basis. Furthermore, the petitioner stated that “this job will entail traveling to customer locations with extended stay domestically or internationally.”

The director found the initial evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued a request for evidence (RFE) on August 17, 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 a response dated October 7, 2007, the petitioner addressed the director’s queries. The petitioner contended that it was the beneficiary’s actual employer, and not an agent, because it would hire, pay, fire, supervise and control the work of the beneficiary. The petitioner submits a copy of a Professional Services Agreement between the petitioner and Jade Technologies, Inc. Attached to this agreement is a Task Order outlining the services required by Jade; however, it does not make reference to the beneficiary. In fact, under section 7, entitled “key personnel,” the order states “N/A.” and is followed in the record by a copy of an independent contractor agreement between Software Folks, Inc., located in Princeton, New Jersey and Jade Technologies, Inc., located in Fargo, North Dakota. An attached service order names the beneficiary as a consultant for Wipro through this agreement, with Seattle, Washington as the worksite and an estimated duration of 9-12 months. With regard to the director’s request for a complete itinerary for the beneficiary’s validity dates, the

petitioner advised it was impossible to submit such a document since it had no way of knowing who its clients would be during the validity period of the visa.

On December 5, 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 contracts and itinerary, and without this documentation, the petitioner could not establish that it met the definition of United States employer or agent.

The primary issue in the present matter is whether the petitioner has established that it meets the regulatory definition of an intending 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 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." 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.

¹ 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 a beneficiary to file an H petition on behalf of the actual employer and the alien. While an employment agency may petition for the H-1B visa, the ultimate end-user of the alien's services is the "true employer" for H-1B visa purposes, since the end-user will "hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work" of the beneficiary "at the root level." *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 387-8 (5th Cir. 2000). Accordingly, despite the intermediary position of the employment agency, the ultimate employer must still satisfy the requirements of the statute and regulations: "To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to an absurd result." *Id.* at 388.

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

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

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).

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 at 388 (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, counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in fact the employer of the beneficiary and asserts that the director's conclusion to the contrary was erroneous. Counsel's focuses on the element of control in his brief, contending that the petitioner at all times exercises control over the beneficiary and thus qualifies, by definition, as his employer. No new evidence is submitted to support this assertion.

To qualify as a United States employer, all three criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) must be met. The Form I-129 and the petitioner's federal tax returns contained in the record indicate that the petitioner has an Internal Revenue Service Tax Identification Number. While the petitioner's job offer dated March 31, 2007 indicates its engagement of the beneficiary to work in the United States, this letter merely outlines the beneficiary's salary and benefits but provides no details regarding the nature of the job offered or its location(s). Therefore, the submitted job offer letter fails to establish that an employer-employee relationship exists.

Despite the director's specific request in the RFE dated August 17, 2007 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 petitioner submitted an agreement with Jade, which in turn had an agreement with Software Folks for the services of the beneficiary for a period of 9-12 months. However, considering that the requested period of approval was from May 15, 2007 to November 3, 2008, the director

requested complete documentation outlining the beneficiary's job duties and duty locations for the entire period. In response, the petitioner advised that this was impossible to foresee. 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 several documents in support of its claim that it was an employer for purposes of the definition above. Specifically, the March 31, 2007 employment letter was submitted, which appears to outline the terms of employment between the petitioner and the beneficiary. Although the petitioner relies on this document as evidence that it will serve as the beneficiary's employer, the petitioner overlooks the fact that this agreement is not executed by the beneficiary. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that this agreement constitutes the terms of employment under which the beneficiary would work. Moreover, the petitioner relies on the subcontractor agreement between Jade and Software Folks as evidence of the petitioner's engagement of the beneficiary. While the petitioner contends that it has a separate agreement with Jade for consulting services, there once again is no specific evidence of the petitioner's employment terms with the beneficiary directly. In addition, the agreement between Jade and the petitioner does not name the beneficiary as a consultant or a party to the agreement.

The minimal information contained in the petition, including the incomplete information reflected in the employment letter and various subcontract agreements 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. The petitioner did not submit an employment contract or any other document describing the beneficiary's claimed employment relationship with the petitioner. Contrary to counsel's assertions, 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)).

Moreover, the petitioner has failed to provide a concise itinerary evidencing that the beneficiary will work only at the petitioner's site in Fargo, North Dakota and not in multiple locations. The petitioner acknowledges that it will send the beneficiary to work on client sites as needed, but fails to provide concise details regarding the needs and locations of these clients. For example, the agreement between Jade and Software Folks indicates that the beneficiary will work in Seattle, Washington. The petitioner's Form I-129, employment letter and response to the request for evidence, however, indicate that the beneficiary will work primarily at the petitioner's main office in Fargo, North Dakota. Finally, the petitioner's employment letter indicates that the beneficiary's job will require traveling to client sites as required, both domestically and internationally.

The evidence, therefore, is insufficient to establish that the petitioner qualified as an employer, as defined by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Merely claiming in its letter dated March 31, 2007 that the petitioner would

exercise complete control over the beneficiary, without evidence to support the claim, is insufficient to establish eligibility in this matter. The evidence of record prior to adjudication did not establish that the petitioner would act as the beneficiary's employer in that it will hire, pay, fire, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiary. Despite the director's specific request for evidence such as employment contracts or agreements, payroll records, or work orders to corroborate its claim, the petitioner failed to submit such evidence that relates specifically to its employment agreement with the beneficiary.

Therefore, 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).

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." The director found that absent documentation such as work orders or contracts between the ultimate end clients and the beneficiary, the petitioner could not alternatively 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 petitioner submits no new evidence on appeal to support a finding that the petitioner is an agent. For this additional reason, the director's decision will not be disturbed.

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). The director specifically noted that the LCA listed the beneficiary's work location as Seattle, Washington. 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 for the entire validity period. Moreover, the director noted that the petitioner made specific claims that it would outsource the beneficiary to client sites as necessary. On appeal, the petitioner argues that it did submit a valid LCA, and that it therefore fully complied with the requirements for a valid LCA at the time of filing.

Upon review, the AAO concurs with the director's finding. The March 31, 2007 letter indicates that the petitioner's clients include companies throughout the United States and abroad. The petitioner claims in the March 31, 2007 letter and on the Form I-129 that the beneficiary will work primarily at the main office in Fargo, North Dakota; however, the LCA submitted with the petition lists the work location as Seattle, Washington. While the location identified in the agreement with Jade and Software Folks is Seattle, this agreement is deficient because it does not indicate the petitioner's relationship with the beneficiary regarding this employment arrangement. Nevertheless, the contradictory claims of work locations at both Fargo and Seattle, along with the acknowledgement that client projects are performed either at client sites or at the petitioner's office, raises questions regarding the validity of the LCA and the other claims of the petition. 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).

Assuming that the claims of the petitioner, which indicate that the beneficiary will be sent domestically or abroad to client sites as necessary, is legitimate, it renders the submitted LCA's location of only Seattle, Washington insufficient to meet the requirements of section 212(n)(1)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1)(A). 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 must 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 determined to be a specialty occupation. Therefore, of greater importance to this proceeding 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 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, 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), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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 that of a project manager.

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 employment letter addressed to the beneficiary and dated March 31, 2007 provided the following list of the beneficiary’s duties:

In the capacity of Project Manager, you will Monitor and manage project resources, processes, deliverables and schedules; Conduct formal review meetings focusing on metric reviews; Monitor performance of team members, Sending daily/Weekly status reports;

Ensure that standards and guidelines set for the Project are followed; Participate in the peer-reviews; Ensure the deliverables are meeting the committed SLAs; Review the customer feedback and take corrective action; Provide performance feedback to the team; Assist with training and identify training needs; Establish policies, procedures and best practices for delivering service, etc.

However, no independent documentation to further explain the nature and scope of these duties was submitted. Noting that the petitioner, as an information technology services company, was engaged in an industry that typically outsourced its personnel to client sites to work on particular projects, 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. Again, 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).

As discussed above, the record contains simply a copy of the employment letter to the beneficiary. However, this document provides no specific details regarding the nature of the beneficiary's proposed position and accompanying duties. Although two consulting agreements are submitted in support of the petition, the first, between the petitioner and Jade, does not pertain to the beneficiary, and the second, between Jade and Software Folks, identifies the beneficiary by name but provides no description of required services or duties. 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. 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 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 when contracts are executed. Despite the director's specific request for documentation to establish the ultimate location(s) of the beneficiary's employment, the petitioner failed to comply. Moreover, the petitioner's failure to provide evidence of a credible offer of employment 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 United States baccalaureate degree or its 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)(iii)(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).

For the reasons set forth above, even if the other stated grounds of ineligibility had been overcome on appeal, the petitioner has failed to supplement the record with sufficient evidence to establish that the beneficiary would be performing the duties of a specialty occupation, and the petition cannot be approved for this reason.

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 appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.