

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

[REDACTED]

D2

Date: DEC 27 2011

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

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,

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 summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is an information technology consulting company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to establish that: (1) it meets the regulatory definition of an intending United States employer as defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii); (2) it meets the definition of "agent" at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F); (3) it submitted a valid labor condition application (LCA) for all locations; and (4) the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

The petitioner submitted a timely Form I-290B on January 19, 2010 and indicated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. As of this date, however, the AAO has not received any additional evidence into the record. Therefore, the record is considered complete as currently constituted.

The director provided a detailed analysis and specifically cited the deficiencies in the evidence in the course of the denial. The petitioner's statement on Form I-290B does not specifically identify any errors on the part of the director and is therefore insufficient to overcome the conclusions the director reached based on the evidence submitted by the petitioner. Specifically, the petitioner states:

Per USCIS regulations, filed manuals, and policies employer is a United States business. Additionally USCIS has held that the employer is a qualified business by issuing it H1B visas for the same or substantially the same position, in the past.

Position is a qualifying specialty occupation requiring a minimum of a 4 year college degree in the area of specialty. The job duties are sufficiently complex to require a degree.

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v). The petitioner fails to specify how the director made any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the petition. As neither the petitioner nor counsel presents additional evidence on appeal to overcome the decision of the director, the appeal will be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

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

██████████
Page 3

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.