

**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



B₂

FILE: WAC 08 165 50753 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **JAN 14 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).

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

DISCUSSION: The director, California 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 brand and packaging company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a production specialist. 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 the beneficiary was no longer in H-1B status at the time the petition was filed, she did not meet the requirements of section 106 of AC21 and thereby did not establish that she was eligible for an extension of stay in H-1B status.

On appeal, counsel contends that the director erred in denying the petition, and that the beneficiary qualifies for an additional year of stay in H-1B status.

A review of the records of the Citizenship and Immigration Services 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 March 10, 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.