

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

D2

Date: **APR 12 2012** 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]

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 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 computer board design services company that seeks to continue to employ the beneficiary as a design engineer. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors to continue 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 petitioner had failed to demonstrate that it qualified to extend the validity of the beneficiary's petition and period of stay in the H-1B classification beyond the maximum six-year period of stay in the United States. On appeal, counsel contends that the director erroneously denied the petition, and submits a brief and additional evidence in support of the beneficiary's eligibility for a 7th year extension.

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.

The issue before the AAO is whether the beneficiary is eligible for an extension of H-1B status and an extension of his stay in H-1B nonimmigrant classification beyond the maximum six-year period of stay in the United States normally permitted for H-1B nonimmigrants. A review of the record, however, demonstrates a more critical, but related issue pertaining to the petitioner's eligibility to extend its employment of the beneficiary in H-1B status. Specifically, the petition must be denied as it was filed after the expiration of the petition it sought to extend. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(14) (stating that a "request for a petition extension may be filed only if the validity of the original petition has not expired"). In this matter, the petition that the petitioner sought to extend [REDACTED] expired on August 12, 2008. The instant petition was filed on October 8, 2008, nearly two months after the original petition's expiration.

As opposed to a discretionary extension of stay application, there is no discretion to grant a late-filed petition extension. In this matter, the director did not raise this issue in the denial, and thus it appears that the director may have erroneously exercised favorable discretion to the petitioner under the provisions of 8 C.F.R. § 214.1(c)(4)(i). The director's error is harmless, however, because the AAO conducts a *de novo* review, evaluating the sufficiency of the evidence in the record according to its probative value and credibility, and the omission of this non-discretionary ground for denial did not result in the improper granting of a benefit in this matter, i.e., the error did not change the outcome of this case. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004); *Black's Law Dictionary* 563 (7th Ed., West 1999) (defining the term "harmless error" and stating that it is not grounds for reversal).

As noted above, the petition must be denied as it was filed after the expiration of the petition it sought to extend. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(14). This non-discretionary basis for denial renders the remaining issue in this proceeding moot. For this reason, the appeal must be dismissed and the petition denied.

Even if the remaining issue in this proceeding was not moot, however, it could not be found that eligibility for the benefit sought had been otherwise established. Specifically, a review of the record reveals that the petitioner did not establish that the beneficiary remained eligible for an exemption from section 214(g)(4) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(4).

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. The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied.

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