


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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

**PUBLIC COPY**



D2

Date: **DEC 15 2011** Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE:

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:**

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

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, California Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will remain denied.

The petitioner is a software development and consulting company established in 1999. It employed 27 personnel, and had earned over \$3,000,000 in gross annual income when the petition was filed. It seeks to continue the employment of the beneficiary as a programmer analyst and to classify him 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 on the grounds that: (1) the petitioner failed to establish that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation; (2) the petitioner failed to establish that it qualifies as a U.S. employer or agent; and (3) the petitioner failed to submit an appropriate and valid Labor Condition Application (LCA).

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129, Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker, and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the notice of decision; and (5) Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with counsel's supplemental brief and additional documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

In the petition submitted on September 24, 2009, the petitioner indicated that it wished to continue the employment of the beneficiary as a programmer analyst for an additional three years, from October 1, 2009 until September 30, 2012 at an annual salary of \$73,200.

In the September 22, 2009 letter submitted in support of the petition, the petitioner stated that it provides IT solutions and professional services to primarily Fortune 1000 customers in various industries. The petitioner noted that the beneficiary would continue to work as a programmer analyst on a project with [REDACTED] located [REDACTED]. The petitioner indicated:

[The beneficiary] will continue to analyze, design, develop and implement software and internet applications using Java/.net technologies. He will also develop dynamic Web pages, develop reports. The prototype design of the project involves preparing wireframes using Adobe tools like: Photoshop to design screen shots, Fireworks, Dreamweaver and Microsoft tools like FrontPage. The scripting part of the project involves JavaScript, DHTML, AJAX, Jquery, Yahoo UI, Dojo.

The petitioner stated that due to the technical nature of the duties to be performed, the position requires, at a minimum, a bachelor's degree or higher in engineering, computer science or a closely related field.

The Labor Condition Application (LCA) accompanying the petition indicated that the petitioner was located [REDACTED] and that the beneficiary would work [REDACTED] from October 1, 2009 until September 30, 2012.

On October 7, 2009, the director issued an RFE advising the petitioner, in part, that as it appeared to be engaged in the business of consulting, staffing, or job placement, the petitioner must clarify the petitioner's employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary. The director requested copies of signed contracts between the petitioner and the beneficiary, a complete itinerary of services and the names and addresses of the actual employer(s), and copies of signed contractual agreements, statements of work, or other agreements between the petitioner and the authorized officials of the ultimate end-client companies where the work would actually be performed. The director requested a comprehensive description of the beneficiary's proposed duties where the work would ultimately be performed.

In response, counsel for the petitioner provided the petitioner's May 11, 2006 offer of employment to the beneficiary offering him a position as computer programmer in [REDACTED]. The job offer listed the duties of the position as: designing client server systems, application system development, and database design and development. The record also included a copy of a September 15, 2009 contract between the petitioner and [REDACTED] which provided that [REDACTED] could terminate any individual purchase order with no notice on the understanding that [REDACTED] client had terminated the purchase order. A work order attached to the contract listed the beneficiary as the consultant, the start date of the work order as September 16, 2009, the end date as September 15, 2010, and the name of the supervisor of the project. [REDACTED] provided an itinerary listing the beneficiary as the petitioner's employee and indicating that the beneficiary would work on the benefit enrollment and administration system project (BEAS) for "over 1 year." A September 17, 2009 letter signed by [REDACTED] representative provided the same description of job duties as outlined in the petitioner's initial letter in support of the petition and indicated that the position required a bachelor's degree in computer science, information systems or engineering. [REDACTED] representative noted that the beneficiary would work on its BEAS project and that it was expected that the work would continue at [REDACTED] offices for more than a year. The letter also identified the beneficiary's supervisor, a [REDACTED] employee.

The director denied the petition on November 10, 2009.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the evidence of record demonstrates that the beneficiary will be performing services in a specialty occupation as the petitioner's employee and that the services will be performed in Evanston, Illinois as indicated on the LCA. Counsel contends that the director arbitrarily dismissed the evidence submitted based on erroneous assumptions regarding the perceived nature of the beneficiary's employment. Counsel provides an overview of the BEAS project and avers that this project is DSR's in-house project and that [REDACTED] is the ultimate end-user of the beneficiary's services.

The AAO will first consider whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation. 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 [(1)] 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 [(2)] 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), 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.

The AAO notes that, 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. *Id.* at 387-388. 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. In this matter, the petitioner initially provided a broad overview of the duties of the proffered position. In response to the director’s RFE, the petitioner provided a letter from the claimed end-client reciting the same broad description. It is not possible to discern from the overview of the information provided by the petitioner and ██████ that the beneficiary’s assignment and actual day-to-day duties entail primarily H-1B caliber work. Further, even if the petitioner were to demonstrate, which it did not do, that the beneficiary will work as a programmer analyst for ██████ for the duration of the petition, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

The AAO recognizes the U.S. Department of Labor’s *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.<sup>1</sup> The Programmer Analyst occupational category is addressed in two chapters of the *Handbook* (2010-11 online edition) – “Computer Software Engineers and Computer Programmers” and “Computer Systems Analysts.”

The *Handbook* describes computer programmers as follows:

[C]omputer programmers write programs. After computer software engineers and systems analysts design software programs, the programmer converts that design into a logical series of instructions that the computer can follow (A section on computer systems analysts appears elsewhere in the Handbook.). The programmer codes these instructions in any of a number of programming

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed on the Internet, at <http://www.stats.bls.gov/oco/>. The AAO’s references to the *Handbook* are to the 2010 – 2011 edition available online.

languages, depending on the need. The most common languages are C++ and Python.

Computer programmers also update, repair, modify, and expand existing programs. Some, especially those working on large projects that involve many programmers, use computer-assisted software engineering (CASE) tools to automate much of the coding process. These tools enable a programmer to concentrate on writing the unique parts of a program. Programmers working on smaller projects often use “programmer environments,” applications that increase productivity by combining compiling, code walk-through, code generation, test data generation, and debugging functions. Programmers also use libraries of basic code that can be modified or customized for a specific application. This approach yields more reliable and consistent programs and increases programmers' productivity by eliminating some routine steps.

As software design has continued to advance, and some programming functions have become automated, programmers have begun to assume some of the responsibilities that were once performed only by software engineers. As a result, some computer programmers now assist software engineers in identifying user needs and designing certain parts of computer programs, as well as other functions. . . .

\* \* \*

[M]any programmers require a bachelor's degree, but a 2-year degree or certificate may be adequate for some positions. Some computer programmers hold a college degree in computer science, mathematics, or information systems, whereas others have taken special courses in computer programming to supplement their degree in a field such as accounting, finance, or another area of business. . . .

The *Handbook's* section on computer systems analysts reads, in pertinent part:

In some organizations, programmer-analysts design and update the software that runs a computer. They also create custom applications tailored to their organization's tasks. Because they are responsible for both programming and systems analysis, these workers must be proficient in both areas. (A separate section on computer software engineers and computer programmers appears elsewhere in the Handbook.) As this dual proficiency becomes more common, analysts are increasingly working with databases, object-oriented programming languages, client-server applications, and multimedia and Internet technology.

\* \* \*

[W]hen hiring computer systems analysts, employers usually prefer applicants who have at least a bachelor's degree. For more technically complex jobs, people with graduate degrees are preferred. For jobs in a technical or scientific environment, employers often seek applicants who have at least a bachelor's degree in a technical field, such as computer science, information science, applied mathematics, engineering, or the physical sciences. For jobs in a business environment, employers often seek applicants with at least a bachelor's degree in a business-related field such as management information systems (MIS). Increasingly, employers are seeking individuals who have a master's degree in business administration (MBA) with a concentration in information systems.

Despite the preference for technical degrees, however, people who have degrees in other areas may find employment as systems analysts if they also have technical skills. Courses in computer science or related subjects combined with practical experience can qualify people for some jobs in the occupation. . . .

As evident in the excerpts above, the *Handbook's* information on educational requirements in the programmer analyst occupation indicates that a bachelor's or higher degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty is not a normal minimum entry requirement for this occupational category. Rather, the occupation accommodates a wider spectrum of educational credentials.

To reiterate, the information in the *Handbook* does not indicate that programmer analyst positions normally require at least a bachelor's degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. While the *Handbook* indicates that a bachelor's degree level of education in a specific specialty may be preferred for particular positions, the generically described position duties in this matter do not demonstrate a requirement for the theoretical and practical application of highly specialized computer-related knowledge.

As the *Handbook* indicates no specific degree requirement for employment as a programmer analyst, and as it is not self-evident that, as described in the record of proceeding, the proposed duties comprise a position for which the normal entry requirement would be at least a bachelor's degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty, the AAO concludes that the performance of the proffered position's duties does not require the beneficiary to hold a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not established its proffered position as a specialty occupation under the requirements of the first criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Next, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not satisfied the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). This prong alternatively requires a petitioner to establish that a bachelor's degree, in a specific specialty, is common to the petitioner's industry in positions that are both: (1) parallel to the proffered position; and (2) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

In determining whether there is such a common degree requirement, factors often considered by USCIS include: whether the *Handbook* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." See *Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1165 (D.Minn. 1999) (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

As already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* reports an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty. The petitioner has not provided other evidence that a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty is an industry-wide standard for a parallel position in organizations similar to the petitioner.

The petitioner also failed to satisfy the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), which provides that "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." The evidence of record does not refute the *Handbook's* information to the effect that a bachelor's degree is not required in a specific specialty. The record lacks sufficiently detailed and consistent information to distinguish the proffered position as unique from or more complex than other generic computer software positions that can be performed by persons without a specialty degree or its equivalent.

The petitioner also fails to establish that it normally requires a bachelor's in a specific specialty. Although the prior H-1B petition for the beneficiary was approved, the AAO is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. See, e.g., *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 597 (Comm'r 1988). If any of the previous nonimmigrant petitions were approved based on the same general description and unsupported assertions that are contained in the current record, they would constitute material and gross error on the part of the director. It would be absurd to suggest that USCIS or any agency must treat acknowledged errors as binding precedent. *Sussex Engg. Ltd. v. Montgomery*, 825 F.2d 1084, 1090 (6th Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 485 U.S. 1008 (1988). A prior approval does not compel the approval of a subsequent petition or relieve the petitioner of its burden to provide sufficient documentation to establish current eligibility for the benefit sought. 55 Fed. Reg. 2606, 2612 (Jan. 26, 1990). A prior approval also does not preclude USCIS from denying an extension of an original visa petition based on a reassessment of eligibility for the benefit sought. See *Texas A&M Univ. v. Upchurch*, 99 Fed. Appx. 556, 2004 WL 1240482 (5th Cir. 2004). Furthermore, the AAO's authority over the service centers is comparable to the relationship between a court of appeals and a district court. Even if a service center director had approved nonimmigrant petitions on behalf of a beneficiary, the AAO would not be bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. *Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS*, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D. La.), aff'd, 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), cert. denied, 122 S.Ct. 51 (2001).

The record does not include specific information supported by documentation that the petitioner normally hires only individuals with specific degrees to perform the duties of the proffered position. 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'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm'r 1972)). Therefore, the petitioner has not satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The fourth criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) requires a petitioner to establish that the nature of its position's duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree. The AAO finds that the evidence in the record of proceeding does not support the proposition that the performance of the proposed duties as generically described requires a higher degree of IT/computer knowledge than would normally be required of other information technology professionals not equipped with at least a bachelor's degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty. The AAO, therefore, concludes that the proffered position has not been established as a specialty occupation under the requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

For the reasons related in the preceding discussion, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under the requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The AAO therefore affirms the director's finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation.

Next, the AAO finds that the petitioner has failed to establish that it will be the beneficiary's employer or agent. Under the test of *Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. v. Darden* (*Darden*), 503 U.S. 318, 322-323 (1992) (hereinafter "*Darden*"), the United States Supreme Court 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." *Darden*, 503 U.S. 318 at 322-323 (quoting *Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid*, 490 U.S. 730 (1989)). The Supreme Court stated:

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 *Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates, P.C. v. Wells*, 538 U.S. at 440 (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)).<sup>2</sup>

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 must focus on the common-law touchstone of “control.” *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450; see also 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii)(2) (defining a “United States employer” as one who “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 ...” (emphasis added)).

Factors indicating that a worker is or will be an “employee” of an “employer” are clearly

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 (2<sup>nd</sup> 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 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, 844-845 (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)(ii). 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 of having a tax identification number and to employ persons in the United States. The lack of an express expansion of the definition regarding the terms “employee,” “employed,” “employment” or “employer-employee relationship” indicates that the regulations do not intend 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)(H)(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).

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).

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 may affect the determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists. 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).<sup>3</sup>

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*, 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. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d at 388. Similarly, in this matter, the petitioner's contract with [REDACTED] to determine the termination of the work order for the beneficiary's services. Moreover, the petitioner acknowledges that [REDACTED] personnel will directly supervise the beneficiary's day-to-day work. The record in this matter does not include sufficient indicia establishing that the petitioner will control the beneficiary's work. The beneficiary will not work on the petitioner's premises, the duties of the assignment have been described generally, and the work order listing the beneficiary as the worker indicates the project will end September 15, 2010 prior to the requested end date for the beneficiary's H-1B classification. Other than putting the beneficiary on its payroll and providing benefits, it is unclear what role the petitioner has in the beneficiary's assignment to the end user.

In view of the above, it appears that the beneficiary will not be an "employee" having an "employer-employee relationship" with the petitioner or even with a "United States employer"

---

<sup>3</sup> When examining the factors relevant to determining control, USCIS must assess and weigh each actual factor itself as it exists or will exist and not the claimed employer's right to influence or change that factor, unless specifically provided for by the common-law test. *See Darden*, 503 U.S. at 323-324. For example, while the assignment of additional projects is dependent on who has the *right to* assign them, it is the *actual* source of the instrumentalities and tools that must be examined, not who has the *right to* provide the tools required to complete an assigned project. *See id.* at 323.

represented by the petitioner in a documented agent relationship. It has not been established that the beneficiary will be “controlled” by the petitioner or even that the termination of the beneficiary’s employment is the ultimate decision of the petitioner. 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).

The AAO therefore affirms the director’s finding that the petitioner does not qualify as a United States employer, as it failed to establish that it will control the beneficiary’s work such that it will have an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary.

Third, the petitioner has not established that the LCA corresponds to the petition by encompassing all of the work locations and related wage requirements for the beneficiary’s requested employment period.

In pertinent part, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(B) states:

The petitioner shall submit the following with an H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation: (1) A certification from the Secretary of Labor that the petitioner has filed a labor condition application . . . .

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1) states, in pertinent part:

An applicant or petitioner must establish that he or she is eligible for the requested benefit at the time of filing the application or petition. All required application or petition forms must be properly completed and filed with any initial evidence required by applicable regulations and/or the form’s instructions.

In addition, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B)(1), states, as part of the general requirements for petitions involving a specialty occupation, that:

Before filing a petition for H-1B classification in a specialty occupation, the petitioner shall obtain a certification from the Department of Labor that it has filed a labor condition application in the occupational specialty in which the alien(s) will be employed.

Moreover, while DOL is the agency that certifies LCA applications before they are submitted to USCIS, DOL regulations note that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (i.e., its immigration benefits branch, USCIS) is the department responsible for determining whether the content of an LCA filed for a particular Form I-129 actually supports that petition. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b), which states, in pertinent part:

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.]

The petitioner in this matter has not established that it has sufficient H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary for the duration of the H-1B employment period. As the work order for the beneficiary's services terminates on September 15, 2010, prior to the end date of the beneficiary's requested H-1B classification, it is not possible to establish conclusively that the beneficiary will work in [REDACTED] for the entire duration of the petition. Again, 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. at 165. In light of the fact that the record of proceeding is insufficient to establish the beneficiary's work location for the duration of the classification, USCIS cannot conclude that this LCA actually supports and fully corresponds to the H-1B petition. A petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1). A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. at 248. The AAO therefore affirms the director's determination that the LCA submitted is not a valid LCA for the instant petition.

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 remains denied.