


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



02

Date: **MAR 20 2012** 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 of the California Service Center denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant petition seeking to employ the beneficiary in the position of systems analyst as an H-1B nonimmigrant 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 petitioner describes itself as a professional services firm that designs, develops and integrates enterprise software applications.

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 by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii); and (2) the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner submits a brief and additional evidence, and contends that the director's findings were erroneous.

When filing the I-129 petition, the petitioner averred in its December 17, 2009 letter of support that its capabilities included the "ability to successfully develop and manage solutions for small enterprise to global organizations" and that it provided "end-to-end software development and support capabilities with option to assemble a team quickly comprised of state side and offshore resources" to fit the needs of its clients. Regarding the beneficiary, the petitioner stated that he would be employed as a computer systems analyst, and that he would be working on an in-house project for the duration of the requested validity period.

The director found the initial evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued a request for evidence (RFE) on January 6, 2010. In the request, the director asked the petitioner to submit evidence demonstrating who the actual employer of the beneficiary would be. The director requested documentation such as contractual agreements or work orders from the actual end-client firm for whom the beneficiary would work. Additionally, the director noted that if the petitioner was acting as an agent, documentation such as an itinerary and a letter discussing the conditions of the employment from the end-client firms must be submitted.

In a response dated February 14, 2010, counsel for the petitioner addressed the director's queries. Counsel claimed that the petitioner was an employer and not an agent, and claimed that the beneficiary would be working for [REDACTED] the end client, at its offices in Costa Mesa, California. Counsel also submitted a copy of the petitioner's offer letter to the beneficiary dated December 8, 2009 which included various supporting documents including a confidentiality agreement; a copy of the beneficiary's itinerary; a copy of the contract between the petitioner and [REDACTED]; a copy of the staffing agreement between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]; and a copy of an email from [REDACTED] dated February 12, 2010. The response to the RFE also included a letter from the petitioner dated February 8, 2010, which provided additional details regarding the petitioner's relationship with [REDACTED].

According to the petitioner's job offer letter dated December 8, 2009 and signed by the beneficiary on December 23, 2009, the petitioner would employ the beneficiary as [REDACTED] at an annual salary of \$90,000 per year. The letter further indicated that the beneficiary's employment would commence on December 29, 2009. The offer letter simply outlined the terms of the beneficiary's employment, including rate of pay, benefits, and obligations of the beneficiary under the agreement.

A review of the remaining documentation submitted in response to the RFE indicates that the petitioner contracted with [REDACTED] via a consulting and confidentiality agreement dated September 29, 2009. According to this agreement, the petitioner would provide consulting services to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] clients, and would assign contractors to each required project pursuant to individual statements of work, which would specify the nature of each project along with the project's length, rate, and location. The petitioner also submitted a copy of a staffing agreement dated January 8, 2009 between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] the claimed end client in this matter, which indicated that [REDACTED] would provide staffing services to [REDACTED] as needed. Finally, the petitioner submitted a statement of work dated December 8, 2009 along with this agreement, which indicates that the beneficiary's services were required on a project referred to as "Batch Job Migration." The statement of work further indicated that the beneficiary's role would be that of [REDACTED] and that the project would commence on December 17, 2009 and continue for 18 months.

On February 24, 2010, the director denied the petition. The director found that the petitioner is a contractor that subcontracts workers with a variety of computer skills to other companies who require such services. The director concluded that, while the petitioner submitted the requested contracts and itinerary in an effort to demonstrate that it would control the beneficiary's work, the documents were insufficient to establish eligibility since they failed to cover the entire validity period and lacked sufficient detail regarding the duties of the beneficiary. The director concluded that the petitioner had failed to establish that it met the definition of United States employer or agent.

On appeal, counsel contends that the evidence of record demonstrates that the petitioner has met the regulatory definition of United States employer, and that the director's findings to the contrary were erroneous.

The first issue in the present matter is whether the petitioner has established that it meets the regulatory definition of an intending United States employer. Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). 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 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 defines an H-1B nonimmigrant in pertinent part as an alien:

subject to section 212(j)(2), who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services . . . in a specialty occupation described in section 214(i)(1) . . . , who meets the requirements for the occupation specified in section 214(i)(2) . . . , and

with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the [Secretary of Homeland Security] that the intending employer has filed with the Secretary [of Labor] an application under section 212(n)(1)

The term "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.

(Emphasis added); *see also* 56 Fed. Reg. 61111, 61121 (Dec. 2, 1991).

Upon review, the AAO concurs with the director's decision. The record is not persuasive in establishing that the petitioner or any of its clients will have an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary.

Although "United States employer" is defined in the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), it is noted that the terms "employee" and "employer-employee relationship" are not defined for purposes of the H-1B visa classification. 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) (2012). The intending employer is described as offering full-time or part-time "employment" to the H-1B "employee." Subsections 212(n)(1)(A)(i) and 212(n)(2)(C)(vii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1)(A)(i), (2)(C)(vii) (2012). Further, the regulations indicate that "United States employers" must file a Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129) in order to classify aliens as H-1B temporary "employees." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1), (2)(i)(A). Finally, the definition of "United States employer" indicates in its second prong 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").

Neither the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service ("INS") nor U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS") defined the terms "employee" or "employer-employee relationship" by regulation for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, even though the regulation describes H-1B beneficiaries as being "employees" who must have an "employer-employee relationship" with a "United States employer." *Id.* Therefore, for purposes of the H-1B visa classification, these terms are undefined.

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." *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)). 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)).

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. See generally 136 Cong. Rec. S17106 (daily ed. Oct. 26, 1990); 136 Cong. Rec. H12358 (daily ed. Oct. 27, 1990). On the contrary, in the context of the H-1B visa classification, the regulations define the term "United States employer" to be even more restrictive than the common law agency definition.¹

¹ 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.), *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

Specifically, the regulatory definition of "United States employer" requires H-1B employers to have a tax identification number, to engage a person to work within 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" or "employer-employee relationship" combined with the agency's otherwise generally circular definition of United States employer in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) indicates that the regulations do not intend to extend the definition beyond "the traditional common law definition" or, more importantly, that construing these terms in this manner would thwart congressional design or lead to absurd results. *Cf. Darden*, 503 U.S. at 318-319.²

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).

² To the extent the regulations are ambiguous with regard to the terms "employee" or "employer-employee relationship," the agency's interpretation of these terms should be found to be controlling unless "plainly erroneous or inconsistent with the regulation." *Auer v. Robbins*, 519 U.S. 452, 461 (1997) (citing *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 359, 109 S.Ct. 1835, 1850, 104 L.Ed.2d 351 (1989) (quoting *Bowles v. Seminole Rock & Sand Co.*, 325 U.S. 410, 414, 65 S.Ct. 1215, 1217, 89 L.Ed. 1700 (1945))).

Therefore, in the absence of an express congressional intent to impose broader definitions, both the "conventional master-servant relationship as understood by common-law agency doctrine" and the *Darden* construction test apply to the terms "employee" and "employer-employee relationship" 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).³

Therefore, in considering whether or not one will be 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) (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)).

The factors indicating that a worker is or will be an "employee" of an "employer" are clearly delineated in both the *Darden* and *Clackamas* decisions. *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 323-324; *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 445; *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 445; *see also* *New Compliance Manual*, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, § 2-III(A)(1) (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, however, 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 relevant to control 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).

³ That 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).

Furthermore, 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.

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."

On appeal, counsel contends that the petitioner has met the regulatory definition of employer, since the petitioner (1) is engaging the beneficiary to work in the United States; (2) is responsible for the payroll, as well as hiring and evaluating the work product of the beneficiary, in addition to supervising and controlling his work; and (3) has a valid Internal Revenue Service tax identification number. In support of this contention, counsel submitted copies of the petitioner's payroll documentation.

To qualify as a United States employer, all three criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) must be met. The AAO acknowledges that Form I-129 and the petitioner's quarterly tax returns contained in the record indicate that the petitioner has an Internal Revenue Service Tax Identification Number. While the petitioner's job offer dated December 8, 2009 indicates its engagement of the beneficiary to work in the United States, this letter merely outlines the beneficiary's salary and benefits but provides no details, other than its title, regarding the nature of the job offered or its location. Therefore, based on the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that an employer-employee relationship exists.

Although the petitioner was afforded an opportunity to supplement the record in the RFE dated January 6, 2010, the petitioner did not fully respond to the director's request. The regulations state that the petitioner shall submit additional evidence as the director, in his or her discretion, may deem necessary. The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8) and (12). Failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

The minimal information contained in the job offer letter is insufficient to establish the nature of the beneficiary's duties and assignments during the requested validity period, and likewise fails to demonstrate the level of control, if any, the petitioner will exercise over the beneficiary. While the record contains a copy of the contract between the petitioner and [REDACTED] and a copy of the staffing agreement between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], these documents shed little light on the beneficiary's proposed position, since they provide no information regarding the nature of the work to be performed. Despite including the statement of work dated September 29, 2009, in which Irvine identifies the beneficiary as the contractor that will work as [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] this document is devoid of any detail regarding the nature of the proposed project and the duties

associated therewith. Although counsel refers to the February 12, 2010 email from [REDACTED] the email likewise provides no detail regarding the duties of the beneficiary. As stated by the director in the denial, without evidence of contracts, work orders, or statements of work that actually describe the duties the beneficiary would perform and for whom, the petitioner fails to establish that it will maintain an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary. Although counsel on appeal claims that the petitioner will supervise the beneficiary in the performance of complex duties listed in the appeal brief, no independent documentation to corroborate these claims has been submitted. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose 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)).

Moreover, the petitioner has failed to provide a concise itinerary evidencing that the beneficiary will work only at the claimed location of [REDACTED], California and not in multiple locations. The petitioner acknowledges that it will send the beneficiary to work on client sites as needed, but fails to provide sufficient details regarding the needs and locations of these clients. Although it submitted the related agreements referenced above, these documents cannot suffice as evidence that the petitioner, and not a third party employer, will act as the beneficiary's employer during the entire three-year period. Since the statement of work dated September 29, 2009 indicates that the beneficiary's services are required on the [REDACTED] project for 18 months beginning on December 17, 2009, and since the requested validity period is from December 17, 2009 until December 17, 2012, the duties and work assignment(s) for the beneficiary for at least half of the requested validity period are not documented.

The evidence, therefore, is insufficient to establish that the petitioner qualified as an employer, as defined by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Merely claiming in its letter dated December 17, 2009 that the petitioner would exercise complete control over the beneficiary, without evidence to support the claim, is insufficient to establish eligibility in this matter. The evidence of record prior to adjudication did not establish that the petitioner would act as the beneficiary's employer in that it will hire, pay, fire, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiary for the entire requested validity period. 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).

Although not examined by the director, the AAO will evaluate the record in the alternative to determine whether the petitioner is an agent. The definition of agent at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F) provides for two types of agents: (1) "an agent performing the function of an employer"; and (2) "a company in the business as an agent involving multiple employers as the representative of both the employers and the beneficiary." Absent documentation such as work orders or contracts between the ultimate end clients and the beneficiary, the petitioner cannot alternatively be considered an agent in this matter. As stated above, 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. The petitioner submits no new evidence on appeal to support a finding that the petitioner is an agent. For this additional reason, the petition will be denied.

The final issue is whether the beneficiary will be employed in a specialty occupation.

It must be noted that for purposes of the H-1B adjudication, the issue of bona fide employment is viewed within the context of whether the petitioner has offered the beneficiary a position that is determined to be a specialty occupation. Therefore, of greater importance to this proceeding is whether the petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to establish that the services to be performed by the beneficiary are those of a specialty occupation.

Section 214(i)(1) of 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 field 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 [(2)] 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 384, 387 (5th Cir. 2000). 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 proffered position is a specialty occupation, the record is devoid of any documentary evidence as to where and for whom the beneficiary would be performing his services, and whether his services would be that of a systems analyst.

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.

The petitioner’s letter of support dated December 17, 2009 claimed that the proffered position of computer systems analyst requires thorough knowledge of computer science, engineering, management information systems, electrical/electronics engineering or research, operations, engineering, or a related field. Regarding the responsibilities of the beneficiary, the petitioner claimed that the beneficiary will be a member of a team interacting with developers and product

marketing to analyze and configure data processing techniques, management information, and statistical, audit, and control systems working on In-House project. The petitioner also provided the following list of the beneficiary's proposed duties:

- Analyze user requirements, current operational procedures, functional specifications, and user's data.
- Custom program design, development and implementation of business applications and systems[.]
- Identify and document business or test requirements to the [sic] support the project.
- Perform object-oriented analysis and preliminary design/development of the solutions for client server platform.
- Utilize object-oriented language and concepts and databases appropriate to the project.
- Devising methods [] appropriate to the project.
- Devising methods and approaches to solve problems and meet [user] needs.
- Create algorithms as needed to manage and implement proposed solutions.
- Participate in test planning and test execution for the functional, system, integration, and performance testing.
- Work with test automation tools for recording/coding in object-oriented languages, execute in regression testing cycles.
- Document and track issues and issue related resolution.
- Support Team in completing test objectives according to the [schedule] set forth by the project manager.
- Test and debug software.

However, no independent documentation to further explain the nature and scope of these duties was submitted. Noting that the petitioner, as a software development company, was engaged in an industry that typically outsourced its personnel to client sites to work on particular projects, the director requested documentation such as contracts and work orders that would outline for whom the beneficiary would render services and what his duties would include at each worksite. Despite the director's specific request for these documents, the petitioner failed to fully comply since the agreements submitted provided no detail with regard to the nature of the project(s) upon which the beneficiary would work or the beneficiary's duties thereon. Again, failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

As discussed above, the record contains a copy of a job offer to the beneficiary in letter form, which provides no details regarding the nature of the beneficiary's proposed position and accompanying duties. Although three consulting agreements are submitted in support of the petition, none of these documents outlines the specific nature of the beneficiary's assignments in accordance with these agreements, and they fail to specifically outline the nature of the proposed projects and the specific

tasks the beneficiary will perform. Simply alleging that the beneficiary will work as part of a team is insufficient. Moreover, it is noted by the AAO that the petitioner claimed that the beneficiary would work on an in-house project in the December 17, 2009 letter of support; however, no evidence to support this claim was submitted, and the claims made after the RFE was issued directly contradict this claim. 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).

Without evidence of contracts, work orders, or statements of work describing the duties the beneficiary would perform and for whom, the petitioner fails to establish that the duties that the beneficiary would perform are those of a specialty occupation. Providing a generic job description that speculates what the beneficiary may or may not do at each worksite is insufficient. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. at 165.

In support of this analysis, USCIS routinely cites *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000), in which an examination of the ultimate employment of the beneficiary was deemed necessary to determine whether the position constitutes a specialty occupation. The petitioner in [REDACTED] was a medical contract service agency that brought foreign nurses into the United States and located jobs for them at hospitals as registered nurses. The court in *Defensor* found that Vintage had “token degree requirements,” to “mask the fact that nursing in general is not a specialty occupation.” *Id.* at 387.

The court in *Defensor* held that for the purpose of determining whether a proffered position is a specialty occupation, the petitioner acting as an employment contractor is merely a “token employer,” while the entity for which the services are to be performed is the “more relevant employer.” *Id.* at 388. The *Defensor* court recognized that evidence of the client companies’ job requirements is critical where the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner. The *Defensor* 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.* In *Defensor*, the court found that that evidence of the client companies’ job requirements is critical if the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner. *Id.*

In this matter, it is unclear whether the petitioner will be an employer or will act as an employment contractor. The job description provided by the petitioner, as well as various statements from the petitioner both prior to adjudication and on appeal, indicate that the beneficiary will be working on client projects and will be assigned to various client worksites when contracts are executed. Despite the director’s specific request for documentation to establish the ultimate location(s) of the beneficiary’s employment, the petitioner failed to fully comply, since the documentation submitted (1) applies only to the first eighteen months of the requested validity period; and (2) fails to provide sufficient details regarding the proposed project and the beneficiary’s role in said project. The AAO,

therefore, cannot analyze whether the beneficiary's duties at each worksite would require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge and at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or the equivalent, as required for classification as a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation under any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) or that the beneficiary would be coming temporarily to the United States to perform the duties of a specialty occupation pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(B)(I).

For the reasons set forth above, the petitioner has failed to supplement the record with sufficient evidence to establish that the beneficiary would be performing the duties of a specialty occupation, and the petition cannot be approved for this reason.

Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO questions whether the petitioner established filing eligibility at the time the Form I-129 was received by USCIS.

General requirements for filing immigration applications and petitions are set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1) as follows:

[E]very application, petition, appeal, motion, request, or other document submitted on the form prescribed by this chapter shall be executed and filed in accordance with the instructions on the form, such instructions . . . being hereby incorporated into the particular section of the regulations requiring its submission

Further discussion of the filing requirements for applications and petitions is found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1):

Demonstrating eligibility at time of filing. 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. Any evidence submitted in connection with the application or petition is incorporated into and considered part of the relating application or petition.

Additionally, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) provides as follows:

Service or training in more than one location. A petition which 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 the Service office which has jurisdiction over I-129H petitions in the area where the petitioner is located. The address which the petitioner specifies as its location on the I-129H petition shall be where the petitioner is located for purposes of this paragraph.

The AAO will first address the requirement that the petitioner submit an itinerary under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B).

The petitioner alleges that the beneficiary will work [REDACTED] on a project for [REDACTED] through the petitioner's agreement with Irvine. In the letter of support, response to the RFE, and employment agreement, however, the petitioner indicates that the beneficiary will also be sent to client sites on an as-needed basis. Finally, no formal documentation outlining the terms and duration of the beneficiary's assignments beyond the eighteen month assignment with [REDACTED] was submitted.

According to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B), a petition which 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. While the petitioner contends that the beneficiary will work on software development projects as needed, there record does not contain contracts, work orders, or vendor agreements for the entire requested validity period to support this contention. Moreover, the petitioner specifically indicates that the beneficiary may travel to various client sites as needed.

Therefore, based on the limited evidence submitted pertaining to the assignment(s) of the beneficiary for the duration of the requested validity period, the petitioner has failed to submit the itinerary required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B). Insufficient documentation identifying the actual end client and definitively stating where and for whom the beneficiary will work during the entire requested validity period has been submitted. The petitioner failed to provide a concise itinerary covering all work locations for the beneficiary during the requested validity period. For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

An additional issue before the AAO is whether the petitioner submitted a valid LCA covering all work locations for the beneficiary at the time of filing.

The regulations require that before filing a Form I-129 petition on behalf of an H-1B worker, a petitioner must obtain a certified LCA from the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) in the occupational specialty in which the H-1B worker will be employed. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B). The instructions that accompany the Form I-129 also specify that an H-1B petitioner must document the filing of a labor certification application with the DOL when submitting the Form I-129.

In the instant case, the petitioner filed the LCA with USCIS along with the initial petition. On the Form I-129, the petitioner indicated that the beneficiary would work in Santa Ana, California at the petitioner's offices. The certified LCA submitted with the petition identified both Santa Ana, California and Costa Mesa, California as worksites for the beneficiary. As noted above, the petitioner claimed that the beneficiary would be assigned to various client sites as needed, but would commence working in Costa Mesa for the petitioner's end client, [REDACTED]

The Form I-129 filing requirements imposed by regulation require that the petitioner submit evidence of a certified LCA at the time of filing. Title 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b) further indicates that

an LCA must correspond to the petition with which it is submitted. The LCA submitted with the petition is certified for two locations within a ten-mile radius of each other.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner failed to submit a certified LCA that corresponds to the petition. While the LCA submitted identifies one geographical location where the beneficiary may perform services, the record clearly indicates that the beneficiary will be tasked to various client cites as needed with no indication that such assignments would be short-term. Since the petitioner indicates in its supporting documentation that it has a diverse and global client base, it is clear that the potential work locations for the beneficiary could vary widely based on client needs during the course of the requested validity period. 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. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978). The petitioner failed to comply with the filing requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B). For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

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.

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.