

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

COMPSEARCH SOFTWARE SERVICES INC.
ATTN: ANAND RAMDAS
1220 IROQUOIS AVE., STE. 207
NAPERVILLE, IL 60563

FILE: WAC 09 007 50515 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **AUG 02 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: SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

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 designing, development and consultation company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst. 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 establish that it qualifies as an employer or agent, that it submitted an appropriate and valid LCA for all work locations, and that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. On appeal, the petitioner submits a letter and supporting documentation.

A review of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records indicates that, subsequent to the filing of the instant petition, another employer filed a Form I-129 petition seeking nonimmigrant H-1B classification on the beneficiary's behalf. USCIS records further indicate that this other employer's petition was approved, which granted the beneficiary H-1B status from August 26, 2009 to January 11, 2012. Because the beneficiary in the instant petition has been approved for employment with another petitioner, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

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