

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy


**PUBLIC COPY**

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

D2



FILE: EAC 08 218 51207 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **APR 05 2010**

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

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner describes itself as a software design and development company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a software engineer. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to submit an itinerary of the beneficiary's employment and because the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner submits a brief and supporting documentation.

A review of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records indicates that this beneficiary is also the beneficiary of an approved immigrant petition and has adjusted status to that of a U.S. permanent resident as of August 17, 2009. While the petitioner has not withdrawn the appeal in this proceeding, it would appear that the beneficiary is presently a permanent resident and the issues in this proceeding are moot. Therefore, this appeal is dismissed.

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