

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

[Redacted]

D2

FILE: [Redacted] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 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:

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 \$630. 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,

*Michael T. Kelly*  
for Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The director of the 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 petition will be denied.

The petitioner is a child welfare agency biomedical company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a clinical supervisor. 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, finding that the beneficiary is not eligible for extension of H-1B nonimmigrant status under the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act because a final decision was made on the alien's employment-based immigrant petition.

In general, section 214(g)(4) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(4) provides that: "[T]he period of authorized admission of [an H-1B nonimmigrant] shall not exceed 6 years." However, the American Competitiveness in the Twenty-First Century Act (AC21), as amended by the Twenty-First Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (21<sup>st</sup> Century DOJ Appropriations Act), removes the six-year limitation on the authorized period of stay in H-1B visa status for certain aliens whose labor certifications or immigrant petitions remain undecided due to lengthy adjudication delays, and broadens the class of H-1B nonimmigrants who may avail themselves of this provision.

As amended by § 11030(A)(a) of the DOJ Authorization Act, § 106(a) of AC-21 reads:

(a) EXEMPTION FROM LIMITATION. -- The limitation contained in section 214(g)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(4)) with respect to the duration of authorized stay shall not apply to any nonimmigrant alien previously issued a visa or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)), if 365 days or more have elapsed since the filing of any of the following:

- (1) Any application for labor certification under section 212(a)(5)(A) of such Act (8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(5)(A)), in a case in which certification is required or used by the alien to obtain status under section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)).
- (2) A petition described in section 204(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. § 1154(b)) to accord the alien a status under section 203(b) of such Act.

Section 11030(A)(b) of the DOJ Authorization Act amended § 106(a) of AC-21 to read:

(b) EXTENSION OF H-1B WORKER STATUS--The Attorney General shall extend the stay of an alien who qualifies for an exemption under subsection (a) in one-year increments until such time as a final decision is made—

(1) to deny the application described in subsection (a)(1), or, in a case in which such application is granted, to deny a petition described in subsection (a)(2) filed on behalf of the alien pursuant to such grant;

(2) to deny the petition described in subsection (a)(2); or

(3) to grant or deny the alien's application for an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

The record indicates that the beneficiary has resided in the United States in H-1B classification since June 12, 1996. On April 16, 2003, the petitioner applied for an extension of H-1B status for the beneficiary which would have placed the beneficiary beyond his six-year limit. The director noted that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records indicated that the beneficiary's Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, Form I-140 [REDACTED] filed with the Nebraska Service Center on March 1, 2001 was denied on August 8, 2001 and the petitioner's appeal was dismissed on September 4, 2002.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's denial letter; and (3) Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

On appeal, counsel contends that the labor certification application upon which the I-140 application is based has been pending for more than 365 days. Consequently, counsel asserts that "the date of the labor certification" is preserved for adjustment purposes under 245(i). Counsel concludes by stating that the beneficiary meets the first prong of AC-21 and therefore is eligible for an extension of stay beyond her six-year limit under AC21 § 106(a) as it was originally enacted because she is the beneficiary of a labor certification application which is required or used by the beneficiary to obtain status under section 203(b) of the Act. It is noted that counsel refers to "Exhibit A" in support of this contention; however, no supporting documentation or evidence labeled as "Exhibit A" is submitted in support of the appeal.

In this matter, no evidence to support counsel's contentions is submitted. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). There is no evidence in the record to support a finding that a labor certification application on behalf of the beneficiary has been pending for more than 365 days. Moreover, as stated above, USCIS records show that at the time the extension request was filed on April 16, 2003, the appeal of the beneficiary's I-140 petition had been adjudicated and the petition had been denied.

The beneficiary, therefore, is not eligible for a 7<sup>th</sup> year extension of status. The Form I-140 Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker that was filed on the beneficiary's behalf was denied on August 8, 2001 and the appeal was dismissed on September 4, 2002.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.



Page 4

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