

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 09 085 51334 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 29 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 filed this nonimmigrant petition seeking to employ the beneficiary in the position of senior systems analyst 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 a computer software development and consultancy company and indicates that it currently employs over 60,000 persons worldwide, including 11,942 persons in the United States.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to establish that: (1) the petitioner was a qualified employer or agent; or (2) a valid Labor Condition Application (LCA) was submitted for all work locations. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner submits a brief and additional evidence.

A review of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records indicates that on December 7, 2009, a date subsequent to the denial of the instant petition, the petitioner submitted a new Form I-129 on the beneficiary's behalf. USCIS records further indicate that this second H-1B petition was approved on December 15, 2009, valid from December 21, 2009 until May 4, 2012. Because the beneficiary in the instant petition has been approved for employment with the petitioner based upon the filing of another petition, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

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