

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

82



FILE: EAC 07 245 52861 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 29 2010

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:
[Redacted]

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 Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a hospitalist physician services provider that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a physician. 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, holding that, as 365 or more days had not passed since the priority date was established for the pertinent labor certification application, the beneficiary did not meet the requirements of sections 104(c) and 106 of AC21 and thereby did not establish that he was eligible for a seventh year of stay in H-1B status. On appeal, counsel contends that the director erred in denying the petition, and that the beneficiary qualifies for a seventh year of stay in H-1B status.

A review of the records of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) indicates that this beneficiary is also the beneficiary of an approved immigrant petition and has adjusted status to that of a permanent resident as of August 14, 2008. 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.