

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

[Redacted]

Date: **MAR 08 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]

**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 service center director denied the instant nonimmigrant visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed as the matter is now moot.

In the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner described itself as a “software development” firm. To employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a “senior Java developer” position, the petitioner endeavors 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 January 21, 2010, because she determined that (1) the petitioner has not established that there exists a reasonable and credible offer of employment; (2) the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation; and (3) the petitioner failed to submit a valid Labor Condition Application (LCA). On appeal, counsel submitted a brief contending that the director “reached at a[sic] wrong conclusion based on the facts and law.”

A review of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records indicates that on July 1, 2010, a date subsequent to the denial of the instant petition, another employer filed a Form I-129 petition seeking nonimmigrant H-1B classification on behalf of the beneficiary. USCIS records further indicate that this other employer’s petition was approved on January 13, 2011.

Because the beneficiary in the instant petition has been approved for H-1B employment with another petitioner, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

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