

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
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



B2

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: [REDACTED] Date: **APR 05 2011**

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiaries: [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:



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.

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

For H-1B visas . . . DHS accepts the employer's petition (DHS Form I-129) with the DOL certified LCA attached. *In doing so, the DHS determines whether the petition is supported by an LCA which corresponds with the petition, whether the occupation named in the [LCA] is a specialty occupation or whether the individual is a fashion model of distinguished merit and ability, and whether the qualifications of the nonimmigrant meet the statutory requirements of H-1B visa classification.*

[Italics added]. As 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b) requires that USCIS ensure that an LCA actually supports the H-1B petition filed on behalf of the beneficiary, this regulation inherently necessitates the filing of an amended H-1B petition to permit USCIS to perform its regulatory duty to ensure that the new LCA actually supports the H-1B petition filed on behalf of the beneficiary. In addition, as 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1) requires eligibility to be established at the time of filing, it is factually impossible for an LCA certified by DOL after the filing of an initial H-1B petition to establish eligibility at the time the initial petition was filed. Therefore, in order for a petitioner to comply with 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1) and for USCIS to perform its regulatory duties under 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b), a petitioner must file an amended H-1B petition with USCIS whenever a beneficiary's job location changes such that a new LCA is required to be filed with DOL.

Furthermore, to ascertain the intent of a petitioner, USCIS must look to the Form I-129 and the documents filed in support of the petition. It is only in this manner that the agency can determine the exact position offered, the location of employment, the proffered wage, et cetera. If a petitioner's intent changes with regard to a material term and condition of employment or the beneficiary's eligibility, an amended or new petition must be filed. To allow a petition to be amended in any other way would be contrary to the regulations. Taken to the extreme, a petitioner could then simply claim to offer what is essentially speculative employment when filing the petition only to "change its intent" after the fact, either before or after the H-1B petition has been adjudicated. The agency made clear long ago that speculative employment is not permitted in the H-1B program. A 1998 proposed rule documented this position as follows:

Historically, the Service has not granted H-1B classification on the basis of speculative, or undetermined, prospective employment. The H-1B classification is not intended as a vehicle for an alien to engage in a job search within the United States, or for employers to bring in temporary foreign workers to meet possible workforce needs arising from potential business expansions or the expectation of potential new customers or contracts. To determine whether an alien is properly classifiable as an H-1B nonimmigrant under the statute, the Service must first examine the duties of the position to be occupied to ascertain whether the duties of the position require the attainment of a specific bachelor's degree. See section 214(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the "Act"). The Service must then determine whether the alien has the appropriate degree for the occupation. In the case of speculative employment, the Service is unable to perform either part of this two-prong analysis and, therefore, is unable to adjudicate properly a request for H-1B classification. Moreover, there is no assurance that the alien will engage in a specialty occupation upon arrival in this country.

The second issue is whether the petitioner failed to provide an itinerary in support of the petition as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B). Specifically, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) states:

Service or training in more than one location. A petition that requires services to be performed or training to be received in more than one location must include an itinerary with the dates and locations of the services or training and must be filed with USCIS as provided in the form instructions. The address that the petitioner specifies as its location on the Form I-129 shall be where the petitioner is located for purposes of this paragraph.

On appeal, the petitioner claims that, as it will "at all times" be the beneficiary's employer, an itinerary is not required. Although additional itinerary requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F) govern agent-based petitions, the itinerary requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) applies to all H petitions seeking services or training "in more than one location" regardless of who the employer of the beneficiary may be. In this matter, while the petitioner may have initially intended only to employ the beneficiary in one location, i.e., [REDACTED] this intent obviously changed after the petition's filing date when the additional proposed employment in [REDACTED] was either never formalized or it was canceled. The result of which, however, was that the beneficiary, then employed in [REDACTED] was transferred to an additional location in [REDACTED]. Thus, again, whether a single employment location was intended or not, the actual result was the petitioner sought to retroactively authorize the employment in [REDACTED] as well as an additional employment location in [REDACTED] without the filing of an itinerary.

As indicated above, the proper course of action here was for the petitioner to file an amended or new petition. It failed to do this and instead seeks to amend a pending petition with facts / evidence that came into existence after the filing date of the petition. The regulations do not permit such evidence to be accepted or considered. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(1) and (12). As such, the petitioner's attempt to change its petition after the date it was filed or to otherwise amend it in this manner must be rejected. Even if such a change could be accepted, the petitioner would still be required to submit an itinerary, which it again has failed to do. Therefore, the petition must be denied on this additional basis.

Beyond the decision of the director, another issue in the present matter is whether the petitioner has established that it meets the regulatory definition of a United States employer. As that term is defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) such that it has standing to file the instant petition. Specifically, the AAO must determine whether the petitioner has established that it will have "an employer-employee relationship with respect to employees under this part, as indicated by the

63 Fed. Reg. 30419, 30419 - 30420 (June 4, 1998). While a petitioner is certainly permitted to change its intent with regard to non-speculative employment, e.g., a change in duties or job location, it must nonetheless document such a material change in intent through an amended petition in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(E).

fact that it may hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of any such employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii)(2).

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), defines an H-1B nonimmigrant as an alien:

(i) who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services . . . in a specialty occupation described in section 1184(i)(1) . . ., who meets the requirements of the occupation specified in section 1184(i)(2) . . ., and with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines . . . that the intending employer has filed with the Secretary an application under 1182(n)(1).

"United States employer" is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as follows:

United States employer means a person, firm, corporation, contractor, or other association, or organization in the United States which:

- (1) Engages a person to work within the United States;
- (2) Has an employer-employee relationship with respect to employees under this part, as indicated by the fact that it may hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of any such employee; and
- (3) Has an Internal Revenue Service Tax identification number.

The scope of the position is described as follows in the support letter the petitioner submitted with the H-1B petition on behalf of the beneficiary:

Our [REDACTED] participate as members of an engineering team involved in the development, implementation and customization of client/server or web-enabled business applications utilized by corporations for finance, supply and distribution. This position is primarily responsible for [REDACTED] (but not limited to) [REDACTED] with commonly utilized operating system environments, such as [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which functions or relational databases and over a variety of computer network configurations. A successful candidate must: enter program codes into a computer system, input test data into computer, observe computer monitor screen to interpret program-operating codes, correct program errors using methods such as modifying program or altering sequence of program steps. As can be seen, the nature of these duties is so specialized and

complex that the knowledge required to perform these duties is usually associated with the attainment of a Bachelor's degree or some specialized training.

In the support letter, the petitioner goes on to provide the following breakdown of job duties:

- Technical work: will be responsible for Technical Development aspects of projects that is completing as they related to upgrades, conversions, migrations, and implementations (70%);
- Support: This position will also assist in providing support to past and present [the petitioner's] clients (20%);
- Presentations: Assist the sales department of [the petitioner] in presenting the technical aspects of the projects to new or potential clients (5%); and
- Analysis and Recommendations: Participate with [the petitioner's] team that provides comprehensive analysis to [the petitioner's] clients. This analysis includes reviews of previous installations, recommendations for upgrades, data monitoring, security, disaster recovery, etc. (5%).

As indicated above, due to the lack of work in [REDACTED], the beneficiary was transferred to [REDACTED] and a second LCA was submitted for a computer programmer to work in [REDACTED]. The LCA lists a prevailing wage of [REDACTED].

On July 30, 2008, the director issued an RFE stating, in part, that the evidence of record is not sufficient to demonstrate whether the petitioner is the actual employer or acting as an agent, whether a specialty occupation exists, and whether there was a bona fide job offer at the time of filing. The petitioner was also requested, inter alia, to submit copies of its contractual agreements with the beneficiary and with companies for which the beneficiary would be providing consulting services. The director also requested documentation evidencing the petitioner's business operations.

The petitioner responded to the RFE with a letter dated, October 21, 2008, asserting that the petitioner is the actual employer of the beneficiary as it has an employment contract with the beneficiary, it pays the beneficiary's salary and the petitioner controls the work products and assignments given to the beneficiary.

The petitioner submitted a master contractor agreement between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The petitioner presented evidence that [REDACTED] is the former name of the petitioner. The contract includes a purchase order with [REDACTED]. Under the consultant details, the beneficiary is listed. Under the project details, it states the project location as [REDACTED]. The project start date is July 30, 2007 and the end date is "open."

In addition, the petitioner submitted a letter from the [REDACTED], dated April 7, 2008. The letter stated that [REDACTED] "is currently under contract with [REDACTED] for the performance of IT services." The letter further stated that "since

July 2007, [the beneficiary,] an employee of [REDACTED] has been placed on assignment with Rambus Inc. under said contract.

This documentation provided in response to the RFE evidencing that the beneficiary will be assigned to a third party client site through a subcontract between the petitioner and another company provides conflicting information. On the one hand, the letter of verification from [REDACTED] indicates that the beneficiary will be assigned to client sites and that he is an employee of [REDACTED]. On the other hand, the petitioner states on the Form I-129 and the ICA that the beneficiary will be employed by the petitioner at its office in [REDACTED]. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

On appeal, the petitioner, through in-house counsel, asserts the following:

In this instance, the Petitioner supplied contracts between the petitioner and [REDACTED] and a letter from the end client, [REDACTED] showing the beneficiary was on a project in [REDACTED]. The Statement of Work for [REDACTED] provides the information that the beneficiary will be working at [REDACTED]. The letter from [REDACTED] provides information that the beneficiary is providing specialty occupation work on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] financial implementation. The petitioner also provided a contract between themselves and [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] where the beneficiary was anticipated to work but the deal fell through.

The petitioner also states that is “does not have access to the contract between [REDACTED] or [REDACTED].”

The AAO will first address the issue of whether or not the petitioner qualifies as a United States employer. In the RFE response letter and in the appeal brief, counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner is the actual employer.

Given that the offer letter to the beneficiary explicitly states that the beneficiary will be assigned to client sites, and the beneficiary is listed as a contractor in the purchase order agreement, the AAO concludes that the petitioner’s clients are the actual end-user entities that would generate work for the beneficiary and whose business needs would ultimately determine what the beneficiary would actually do on a day-to-day basis. The [REDACTED] letter submitted by the petitioner corroborates the conclusion that the beneficiary is working at a client site. Therefore, by not submitting any documentation justifying the assignment of the beneficiary to the projects for third party client(s) requiring the performance of duties in a specialty occupation, the petitioner precluded the director from determining whether the petitioner has made a bona fide

offer of employment to the beneficiary or that it has or will have sufficient control over the beneficiary to establish an employer-employee relationship based on the evidence of record.²

In addition, as noted above, the letter from [REDACTED] stated that the beneficiary is an employee of [REDACTED]. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. at 591-92.

Although "United States employer" is defined in the regulations, it is noted that "employee," "employed," "employment," and "employer-employee relationship" are not defined for purposes of the H-1B visa classification even though these terms are used repeatedly in both the Act and the regulations, including within the definition of "United States employer" at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act indicates that an alien coming to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation will have an "intending employer" who will file a labor condition application with the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 212(n)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1). The intending employer is described as offering full-time or part-time "employment" to the H-1B "employee." Sections 212(n)(1)(A)(i) and 212(n)(2)(C)(vii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(n)(1)(A)(i) and 1182(n)(2)(C)(vii). Further, the regulations indicate that "United States employers" must file Form I-129 in order to classify aliens as H-1B temporary "employees." 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(1) and 214.2(h)(2)(i)(A). Finally, the definition of "United States employer" indicates in its second criterion that the petitioner must have an "employer-employee relationship" with the "employees under this part," i.e., the H-1B beneficiary, and that this relationship be evidenced by the employer's ability to "hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of any such employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "United States employer"). Accordingly, neither the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) nor U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has defined the terms "employee," "employed," "employment," or "employer-employee relationship" by regulation for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, even though the law describes H-1B beneficiaries as being "employees" who must have an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer."³ Therefore, for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, these terms are undefined.

² Even though the petitioner put in the Form I-129 and LCA that it intends to employ the beneficiary at its office in [REDACTED], given that this information contradicts the statements made in the offer letter and the master contractor agreement submitted by the petitioner as described above, the AAO cannot verify where the beneficiary will actually be employed. Based on the evidence submitted, however, it would appear that the beneficiary will not be employed at the petitioner's office in [REDACTED]. As mentioned previously, it is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92.

³ It is noted that, in certain limited circumstances, a petitioner might not necessarily be the "employer" of an H-1B beneficiary. Under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F), it is possible for an "agent" who will not be the

The Supreme Court of the United States has determined that where federal law fails to clearly define the term "employee," courts should conclude that the term was "intended to describe the conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine." *Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. v. Darden*, 503 U.S. 318, 322-323 (1992) (hereinafter "*Darden*") (quoting *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. 730 (1989)). That definition is as follows:

"In determining whether a hired party is an employee under the general common law of agency, we consider the hiring party's right to control the manner and means by which the product is accomplished. Among the other factors relevant to this inquiry are the skill required; the source of the instrumentalities and tools; the location of the work; the duration of the relationship between the parties; whether the hiring party has the right to assign additional projects to the hired party; the extent of the hired party's discretion over when and how long to work; the method of payment; the hired party's role in hiring and paying assistants; whether the work is part of the regular business of the hiring party; whether the hiring party is in business; the provision of employee benefits; and the tax treatment of the hired party."

Darden, 503 U.S. at 323-324 (quoting *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. at 751-752); see also *Restatement (Second) of Agency* § 220(2) (1958); *Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates, P.C. v. Wells*, 538 U.S. 440 (2003) (hereinafter "*Clackamas*"). As the common-law test contains "no shorthand formula or magic phrase that can be applied to find the answer, . . . all of the incidents of the relationship must be assessed and weighed with no one factor being decisive." *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324 (quoting *NLRB v. United Ins. Co. of America*, 390 U.S. 254, 258 (1968)).⁴

actual "employer" of the H-1B temporary employee to file a petition on behalf of the actual employer and the beneficiary. However, the regulations clearly require H-1B beneficiaries of "agent" petitions to still be employed by "employers," who are required by regulation to have "employer-employee relationships" with respect to these H-1B "employees." See *id.*; 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(1) and 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "United States employer"). As such, the requirement that a beneficiary have a United States employer applies equally to single petitioning employers as well as multiple non-petitioning employers represented by "agents" under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F). The only difference is that the ultimate, non-petitioning employers of the H-1B employees in these scenarios do not directly file petitions.

⁴ While the *Darden* court considered only the definition of "employee" under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(6), and did not address the definition of "employer," courts have generally refused to extend the common law agency definition to ERISA's use of employer because "the definition of 'employer' in ERISA, unlike the definition of 'employee,' clearly indicates legislative intent to extend the definition beyond the traditional common law definition." See, e.g., *Bowers v. Andrew Weir Shipping, Ltd.*, 810 F. Supp. 522 (S.D.N.Y. 1992), *aff'd*, 27 F.3d 800 (2nd Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1000 (1994). However, in this matter, the Act does not exhibit a legislative intent to extend the definition of "employer" in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, "employment" in section 212(n)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, or "employee" in section 212(n)(2)(C)(vii) of the Act

Therefore, in considering whether or not one is an "employee" in an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer" for purposes of H-1B nonimmigrant petitions, USCIS will focus on the common-law touchstone of control. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. Factors indicating that a worker is an "employee" of an "employer" are clearly delineated in both the *Darden* and *Clackamas* decisions. 503 U.S. at 323-324; *see also* *Restatement (Second) of Agency* § 220(2) (1958). Such indicia of control include when, where, and how a worker performs the job; the continuity of the worker's relationship with the employer; the tax treatment of the worker; the provision of employee benefits; and whether the work performed by the worker is part of the employer's regular business. *See Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; *cf. New Compliance Manual*, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, § 2-III(A)(1), (EEOC 2006) (adopting a materially identical test and indicating that said test was based on the *Darden* decision); *see also Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 388 (5th Cir. 2000) (determining that hospitals, as the recipients of beneficiaries' services, are the true "employers" of H-1B nurses under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h), even though a medical contract service agency is the actual petitioner, because the hospitals ultimately hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiaries).

It is important to note that the factors listed in *Darden* and *Clackamas* are not exhaustive and must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Other aspects of the relationship between the parties

beyond the traditional common law definitions. Instead, in the context of the H-1B visa classification, the term "United States employer" was defined in the regulations to be even more restrictive than the common law agency definition. A federal agency's interpretation of a statute whose administration is entrusted to it is to be accepted unless Congress has spoken directly on the issue. *See Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 844-45 (1984).

The regulatory definition of "United States employer" requires H-1B employers to have a tax identification number, to employ persons in the United States, *and* to have an "employer-employee relationship" with the H-1B "employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(i). Accordingly, the term "United States employer" not only requires H-1B employers and employees to have an "employer-employee relationship" as understood by common-law agency doctrine, it imposes additional requirements, thus indicating that the regulations do not indicate an intent to extend the definition beyond "the traditional common law definition." Therefore, in the absence of an intent to impose broader definitions by either Congress or USCIS, the "conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine," and the *Darden* construction test, apply to the terms "employee," "employer-employee relationship," "employed," and "employment" as used in section 101(a)(15)(I)(i)(b) of the Act, section 212(n) of the Act, and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h). That being said, there are instances in the Act where Congress may have intended a broader application of the term "employer" than what is encompassed in the conventional master-servant relationship. *See, e.g.,* section 214(c)(2)(F) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(c)(2)(F) (referring to "unaffiliated employers" supervising and controlling L-1B intracompany transferees having specialized knowledge); section 274A of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1324a (referring to the employment of unauthorized aliens).

may affect the determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists or will exist. Furthermore, not all or even a majority of the listed criteria need be met; however, the fact finder must weigh and compare a combination of the factors in analyzing the facts of each individual case. The determination must be based on all of the circumstances in the relationship between the parties, regardless of whether the parties refer to it as an employee or as an independent contractor relationship. See *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 448-449; *New Compliance Manual* at § 2-III(A)(1).

Likewise, the "mere existence of a document styled 'employment agreement'" shall not lead inexorably to the conclusion that the worker is an employee. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. "Rather, as was true in applying common-law rules to the independent-contractor-versus-employee issue confronted in *Darden*, the answer to whether a shareholder-director is an employee depends on 'all of the incidents of the relationship . . . with no one factor being decisive.'" *Id.* at 451 (quoting *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324).

Applying the *Darden* and *Clackamas* tests to this matter, the petitioner has not established that it or any of its clients will be a "United States employer" having an "employer-employee relationship" with the beneficiary as an H-1B temporary "employee."

To qualify as a United States employer, all three criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) must be met. The Form I-129 and the petitioner's tax returns contained in the record indicate that the petitioner has an Internal Revenue Service Tax Identification Number. While the petitioner's letter of support indicates its engagement of the beneficiary to work in the United States, this documentation alone provides no details regarding the nature of the job offered or the location(s) where the services will be performed. Therefore, the petitioner has failed to establish that an employer-employee relationship exists or will exist.

Applying the *Darden* test to this matter, the petitioner has not established that it will be a "United States employer" having an "employer-employee relationship" with the beneficiary as an H-1B temporary "employee." First, under *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d at 387, which came after *Darden* and does not contradict the findings of *Darden*, it was determined that hospitals, as the recipients of beneficiaries' services, are the "true employers" of H-1B nurses under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h), even though a medical contract service agency is the actual petitioner, because the hospitals ultimately hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiaries.

The petitioner asserts that it will be the employer of the beneficiary. However, the documentation submitted when reviewed in its entirety does not support this conclusion. As mentioned above, the offer letter and statements made by the petitioner indicate that the beneficiary will be subcontracted out to clients. Therefore, even if the petitioner will directly pay the salary and benefits to the beneficiary, absent evidence to the contrary, it appears that the client or clients will control and supervise the work of the beneficiary, provide the space and tools necessary to perform the duties, terminate his work on a project, and ultimately pay the beneficiary's salary and benefits, albeit indirectly through the petitioner. This does not indicate that the petitioner has a controlling interest in the beneficiary's employment.

Without seeing a copy of the contract between the petitioner and the end-client company, [REDACTED] or a contract with [REDACTED] it is unclear what role the petitioner has in the beneficiary's assignment other than petitioning for H-1B nonimmigrant status on behalf of the beneficiary and taking a percentage out of his pay in return for outsourcing his services to other companies. However, assuming that the petitioner's client does have a project on which the beneficiary will work, no independent evidence was provided to indicate that the petitioner would control any work to be performed or that the petitioner would even oversee the beneficiary's work, directly or indirectly.

Therefore, the information provided is insufficient to determine whether the beneficiary will be an "employee" having an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer." It has not been established that the beneficiary will be "controlled" by the petitioner or that the termination of the beneficiary's employment is the ultimate decision of the petitioner. Moreover, it is unclear whether there is any work to be performed by the beneficiary and what is the nature of that work. Therefore, based on the tests outlined above, the petitioner has not established that it will be a "United States employer" having an "employer-employee relationship" with the beneficiary as an H-1B temporary "employee." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

The AAO therefore finds that the petitioner does not qualify as a United States H-1B employer, and the petition must be denied for this additional reason.

The AAO will next consider whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation, the third and final issue identified by the director. Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) states, in pertinent part, the following:

Specialty occupation means an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, a proposed position must also meet one of the following criteria:

- (1) A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
- (2) The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
- (3) The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
- (4) The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

As a threshold issue, it is noted that 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must logically be read together with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). In other words, this regulatory language must be construed in harmony with the thrust of the related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *See K Mart Corp. v. Cartier Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996). As such, the criteria stated in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) should logically be read as being necessary but not necessarily sufficient to meet the statutory and regulatory definition of specialty occupation. To otherwise interpret this section as stating the necessary *and* sufficient conditions for meeting the definition of specialty occupation would result in particular positions meeting a condition under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) but not the statutory or regulatory definition. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d at 387. To avoid this illogical and absurd result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as stating additional requirements that a position must meet, supplementing the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

Consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) consistently interprets the term “degree” in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position. Applying this standard, USCIS regularly approves H-1B petitions for qualified aliens who are to be employed as engineers, computer scientists, certified public accountants, college professors, and other such occupations. These professions, for which petitioners have regularly been able to establish a minimum entry requirement in the United States of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, fairly represent the types of specialty occupations that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

In addressing whether the proposed position is a specialty occupation, as discussed above, the AAO finds that the record is devoid of documentary evidence with respect to the end-client firm, and therefore what the beneficiary's work assignment would actually be.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv) provides that "[a]n H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation shall be accompanied by [d]ocumentation . . . or any other required evidence sufficient to establish . . . that the services the beneficiary is to perform are in a specialty occupation." Moreover, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv)(A)(1) specifically lists contracts as one of the types of evidence that may be required to establish that the services to be performed by the beneficiary will be in a specialty occupation.

To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation position, the AAO does not solely rely on the job title or the extent to which the petitioner's descriptions of the position and its underlying duties correspond to occupational descriptions in the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*. Critical factors for consideration are the extent of the evidence about specific duties of the proffered position and about the particular business matters upon which the duties are to be performed. In this pursuit, the AAO must examine the evidence about the substantive work that the beneficiary will likely perform for the entity or entities ultimately determining the work's content.

As recognized by the court in *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d at 387, where the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner, evidence of the client companies' job requirements is critical. The court held that the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service had reasonably interpreted the statute and regulations as requiring the petitioner to produce evidence that a proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation on the basis of the requirements imposed by the entities using the beneficiary's services. Such evidence must be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate the type and educational level of highly specialized knowledge in a specific discipline that is necessary to perform that particular work. The record of proceedings lacks such substantive evidence from any end-user entities that may generate work for the beneficiary and whose business needs would ultimately determine what the beneficiary would actually do on a day-to-day basis. In short, the petitioner has failed to establish the existence of H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary.

The petitioner's failure to establish the substantive nature of the work to be performed by the beneficiary precludes a finding that the proffered position is a specialty occupation under any criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), because it is the substantive nature of that work that determines (1) the normal minimum educational requirement for the particular position, which is the focus of criterion 1; (2) industry positions which are parallel to the proffered position and thus appropriate for review for a common degree requirement, under the first alternate prong of criterion 2; (3) the level of complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position, which is the focus of the second alternate prong of criterion 2; (4) the factual justification for a petitioner's normally requiring a degree or its equivalent, when that is an issue under criterion 3; and (5) the degree of specialization and complexity of the specific duties, which is the focus of criterion 4.

As the record does not contain sufficient evidence of the work the beneficiary would perform for the third party client or clients, the AAO cannot analyze whether his placement is related to the

provision of a product or service that requires the performance of the duties of a specialty occupation worker. Applying the analysis established by the Court in *Defensor*, USCIS has found that the record does not contain any relevant documentation from the end user client(s) for which the beneficiary will provide services that establishes the specific duties the beneficiary would perform. Without this information, the AAO cannot analyze whether these duties would require both the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge and at least a baccalaureate degree or the equivalent in the specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States, as required for classification as a specialty occupation. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(i)(1).

The AAO therefore finds that the petitioner failed to establish that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation.

Finally, the AAO does not need to examine the issue of the beneficiary's qualifications because the petitioner has not provided sufficient documentation to demonstrate that the position is a specialty occupation. In other words, the beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation. As discussed in this decision, it cannot be determined what the actual proffered position is in this matter and, therefore, the issue of whether it will require a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in the specific specialty also cannot be determined. Therefore, the AAO need not and will not address the beneficiary's qualifications further, except to note that, in any event, the petitioner did not submit an education evaluation as required for a foreign degree or other sufficient documentation to show that the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C).

The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

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