



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: NOV 21 2013

OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

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 (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Michael T. Keary
Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director 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.

On the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as a four-employee software consulting and services company¹ established in 2007. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a full-time systems analyst position at a salary of \$66,000 per year,² the petitioner seeks 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 each of three separate and independent grounds, namely, the failure of the evidence of record to: (1) demonstrate the existence of an employer-employee relationship between the petitioner and the beneficiary; (2) establish that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation; and (3) submit a Labor Condition Application (LCA) valid for all work locations when it filed the petition.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains the following: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the director's letter denying the petition; and (5) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation.

Upon review of the entire record of proceeding, the AAO finds that the petitioner has failed to overcome the director's grounds for denying this petition. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO finds an additional aspect which, although not addressed in the director's decision, nevertheless also precludes approval of the petition, namely, the petitioner's failure to demonstrate that it had secured work for the entire period of requested employment when it filed the petition.³ For this additional reason, the petition must also be denied.

¹ The petitioner provided a North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code of 541511, "Custom Computer Programming Services." U.S. Dep't of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, North American Industry Classification System, 2012 NAICS Definition, "541511 Custom Computer Programming Services," <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/sssd/naics/naicsrch> (accessed Nov. 5, 2013).

² The Labor Condition Application (LCA) submitted by the petitioner in support of the petition was certified for use with a job prospect within the occupational classification of "Computer Systems Analysts," SOC (O*NET/OES) Code 15-1121, and for which the appropriate prevailing wage level would be Level I (the lowest of the four assignable wage-rates).

³ The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis (*See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004)), and it was in the course of this review that the AAO identified this additional ground for denial.

I. Pertinent Facts and Procedural History

The petitioner filed the instant petition on June 8, 2012 and stated on the Form I-129 that it intended to employ the beneficiary from October 1, 2012 until September 30, 2015. The petitioner submitted, *inter alia*, a Vendor Subcontracting Agreement executed between the petitioner and [REDACTED] on February 22, 2012, which called for the petitioner to supply personnel to [REDACTED] or its clients.⁴ The petitioner stated on the Form I-129 that the beneficiary would provide services to [REDACTED]

In her January 7, 2013 response to the director's October 20, 2012 RFE, counsel stated that [REDACTED] had found another individual to fill its position. As evidence that the petitioner had secured alternate work for the beneficiary, counsel submitted a Subcontractor Service Agreement executed between the petitioner and [REDACTED] on November 28, 2012, which called for the petitioner to provide personnel to perform services for [REDACTED] clients. Counsel also submitted a "Fee Schedule & Assignment Outline" issued pursuant to the agreement between the petitioner and [REDACTED] dated November 28, 2012, which called for the beneficiary to provide services to [REDACTED] client, which was not named, from January 1, 2013 until January 1, 2014. According to counsel, the beneficiary would provide these services to [REDACTED] at its New Jersey office. The LCA that the petitioner submitted in support of the petition, however, was certified for employment in [REDACTED]. Therefore, the LCA submitted to support this petition as filed did not encompass employment in New Jersey.

The director denied the petition on January 22, 2013. Again, the director denied the petition on the bases of each of her determinations that the petitioner failed: (1) to demonstrate the existence of an employer-employee relationship between the petitioner and the beneficiary; (2) to establish that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation; and (3) to submit a valid Labor Condition Application (LCA) for all work locations when it filed the petition.

On appeal, counsel submits, *inter alia*, a letter from [REDACTED] dated February 7, 2013 stating that the beneficiary is providing services to [REDACTED]. Counsel also submits a letter from [REDACTED] also dated February 7, 2013, in which that company confirms that [REDACTED] has been providing it with software development, maintenance, and support services since 2006.

In adjudicating this petition, the AAO will first address the director's finding that the petitioner has failed to submit a valid LCA for all work locations. It will then discuss the director's determination that the petitioner failed to demonstrate the existence of an employer-employee relationship between the petitioner and the beneficiary. Next, the AAO will discuss its supplemental finding that the petitioner failed to establish that, on the date it filed the petition, it had secured work for the

⁴ It is noted that the petitioner did not submit a copy of an "approved purchase order" referencing services to be provided by the beneficiary as described in the Vendor Subcontracting Agreement. It is therefore not clear that this agreement had any binding effect, with regard to the beneficiary, on the date this petition was filed. This issue will be discussed further later in this decision.

entire period of requested employment. Finally, the AAO will address the director's determination that the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation.

II. Failure to Submit a Valid LCA For all Work Locations

As noted above, although the LCA submitted by the petitioner in support of this petition was certified for employment in [REDACTED] counsel now claims that the beneficiary would actually be working in New Jersey. However, the record does not contain an LCA certified for employment in New Jersey.

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

Every benefit request or other document submitted to DHS must be executed and filed in accordance with the form instructions . . . and such instructions are incorporated into 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. An applicant or petitioner must establish that he or she is eligible for the requested benefit at the time of filing the benefit request and must continue to be eligible through adjudication. Each benefit request must be properly completed and filed with all initial evidence required by applicable regulations and other USCIS instructions. Any evidence submitted in connection with a benefit request is incorporated into and considered part of the request.

The regulations require that before filing a Form I-129 petition on behalf of an H-1B worker, a petitioner must first 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 submit evidence that an LCA has been certified by DOL when submitting the Form I-129.

On appeal, counsel states the following:

It is logistically impossible for my client to speculate which of its end-clients will be in need of the beneficiary's services and at what time and for how long and file a separate LCA for each job location where the beneficiary will potentially be placed.

Counsel, however, identifies no authority for USCIS to waive the LCA requirements. The petitioner's claim is that the beneficiary will work in New Jersey, but the record lacks an LCA certified for employment there. The petition, therefore, must be denied. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed and the petition will be denied on this basis.

III. Employer-Employee Relationship Between the Petitioner and Beneficiary

The AAO will now address the director's first basis for denying this petition: her determination that the petitioner failed to establish that it would engage the beneficiary in an employer-employee relationship.

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)

"United States employer" is defined 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.

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.⁵

⁵ 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

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 318-319.⁶

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 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).

⁶ 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)).

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).⁷

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).

Furthermore, when examining the factors relevant to determining control, USCIS must assess and

(quoting *Bowles v. Seminole Rock & Sand Co.*, 325 U.S. 410, 414, 65 S.Ct. 1215, 1217, 89 L.Ed. 1700 (1945)).

⁷ 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).

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.

Lastly, the “mere existence of a document styled ‘employment agreement’” shall not lead inexorably to the conclusion that the worker is an employee. *Clackamas*, 538 U.S. at 450. “Rather, . . . the answer to whether [an individual] is an employee depends on ‘all of the incidents of the relationship . . . with no one factor being decisive.’” *Id.* at 451 (quoting *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 324).

That the beneficiary would not be providing her services to the petitioner directly is not in dispute. The petitioner’s current claim is that the end-user of the beneficiary’s services would be [REDACTED] client, [REDACTED]. Both counsel and the petitioner claim repeatedly that the petitioner would control the beneficiary’s work, and [REDACTED] makes a similar claim in its February 7, 2013 letter submitted on appeal, stating that neither it nor [REDACTED] will have an employment relationship with the beneficiary.

However, applying the *Darden* and *Clackamas* tests to this matter, the AAO finds that 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.” The record lacks detailed, probative information from [REDACTED], the actual user of the beneficiary’s services, regarding the nature and scope of the services to be provided by the beneficiary. While [REDACTED] brief, three-sentence letter dated February 7, 2013 is acknowledged, that letter does not reference the beneficiary or meaningfully discuss the duties she is to perform for [REDACTED] pursuant to its contract with [REDACTED].

While social security contributions, worker’s compensation contributions, unemployment insurance contributions, federal and state income tax withholdings, and other benefits are still relevant factors in determining who will control an alien beneficiary, other incidents of the relationship, e.g., who will oversee and direct the work of the beneficiary, who will provide the instrumentalities and tools, where will the work be located, and who has the right or ability to affect the projects to which the alien beneficiary is assigned, must also be assessed and weighed in order to make a determination as to who will be the beneficiary’s employer. Without full disclosure of all relevant factors, the AAO is unable to find that the requisite employer-employee relationship will exist between the petitioner and the beneficiary.

The evidence, therefore, is insufficient to establish that the petitioner qualifies as a United States employer, as defined by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Merely claiming in its letters that the petitioner exercises complete control over the beneficiary, without evidence supporting the claim, does not establish eligibility in this matter, particularly in a situation, such as exists here, where the petitioner would be providing the beneficiary to one of its clients. 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)).

Based on the tests outlined above, the evidence in the record of proceeding has not established that the petitioner 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.” 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Accordingly, the petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed on this basis.

IV. Securing of Work for the Period of Requested Employment at Time of Filing

Next, the AAO will discuss its supplemental finding regarding the petitioner’s failure to establish that at the time it filed this petition on June 8, 2012, it had secured work for the entire period of requested employment, that is, October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2015.

As noted above, although the petitioner submitted a copy of a Vendor Subcontracting Agreement executed between the petitioner and [REDACTED] when it filed this petition, it did not submit a copy of an “approved purchase order” referencing services to be provided by the beneficiary as described that agreement. In her January 7, 2013 response to the RFE, counsel conceded that no such document had been issued, and stated the following:

At the time of the original filing, [REDACTED] had refused to issue a Statement of Work with the particulars of the project, duration of the project, hourly rate, etc. because the beneficiary was not legally eligible to work in the US at that point in time and [REDACTED] *did not want to be legally bound by a contract.* . .

(Emphasis added.)

It is therefore clear that the petitioner had not secured work for the beneficiary to perform for [REDACTED] when it filed the petition.

Although the petitioner now claims that the beneficiary would work pursuant to the Subcontractor Service Agreement with [REDACTED] and accompanying “Fee Schedule & Assignment Outline,” the AAO notes that those documents were executed on November 28, 2012, more than five months after this petition was filed. These documents, therefore, also cannot be used by the petitioner to demonstrate that it had secured work for the beneficiary covering the entire period of requested employment (October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2015) when it filed this petition on June 8, 2012.

Furthermore, even if the [REDACTED] documentation pre-dated the filing of the this petition it would still not demonstrate that the petitioner had secured work for the beneficiary covering the entire period of requested employment, because the “Fee Schedule & Assignment Outline” contained a start-date of January 1, 2013 – more than three months after the requested start-date of October 1, 2012. The engagement would end on January 1, 2014, more than 18 months before September 30, 2015, the requested end-date of petition approval.

In any event, the record therefore lacks evidence establishing that, by the time of the petition’s filing, the petitioner had secured definite, non-speculative employment for the three-year period of

employment requested in the petition. USCIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. See 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(12). 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). Thus, even if it were found that the petitioner would be the beneficiary's United States employer as that term is defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), the petitioner has not demonstrated that it would maintain such an employer-employee relationship for the duration of the period requested.⁸ Thus, even if it were determined that the petitioner had overcome the director's grounds for denying this petition (which it has not), the petition could still not be approved for the entire three-year period of employment requested in the petition.

V. Specialty Occupation

Finally, the AAO agrees with the director's determination that the petition must also be denied due to the petitioner's failure to establish that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. As recognized in *Defensor v. Meissner*, it is necessary for the end-client to provide sufficient information regarding the proposed job duties to be performed at its location, and their educational requirements, in order to establish the minimum educational requirements necessary to perform those duties. See *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d at 387-388. In other words, as the nurses in that case would provide services to the end-client hospitals and not to the petitioning staffing company, the petitioner-provided job duties and alleged requirements to perform those duties were irrelevant to a specialty occupation determination. See *id.*

Here, the record of proceeding in this case is similarly devoid of sufficient information from the claimed end-client – [REDACTED] – regarding the beneficiary's job duties and their associated

⁸ The agency made clear long ago that speculative employment is not permitted in the H-1B program. As noted above, a 1998 proposed rule documented this position as follows:

Historically, the Service has not granted H-1B classification on the basis of speculative, or undetermined, prospective employment. The H-1B classification is not intended as a vehicle for an alien to engage in a job search within the United States, or for employers to bring in temporary foreign workers to meet possible workforce needs arising from potential business expansions or the expectation of potential new customers or contracts. To determine whether an alien is properly classifiable as an H-1B nonimmigrant under the statute, the Service must first examine the duties of the position to be occupied to ascertain whether the duties of the position require the attainment of a specific bachelor's degree. See section 214(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the "Act"). The Service must then determine whether the alien has the appropriate degree for the occupation. In the case of speculative employment, the Service is unable to perform either part of this two-prong analysis and, therefore, is unable to adjudicate properly a request for H-1B classification. Moreover, there is no assurance that the alien will engage in a specialty occupation upon arrival in this country.

63 Fed. Reg. 30419, 30419 - 30420 (Jun. 4, 1998). While a petitioner is certainly permitted to change its intent with regard to non-speculative employment, e.g., a change in duties or job location, it must nonetheless document such a material change in intent through an amended or new petition in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(E).

educational requirements. The evidence of record's failure to establish the substantive nature of the work to be performed by the beneficiary, therefore, precludes a finding that the proffered position satisfies any criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), because it is the substantive nature of that work that determines (1) the normal minimum educational requirement for the particular position, which is the focus of criterion 1; (2) industry positions which are parallel to the proffered position and thus appropriate for review for a common degree requirement, under the first alternate prong of criterion 2; (3) the level of complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position, which is the focus of the second alternate prong of criterion 2; (4) the factual justification for a petitioner normally requiring a degree or its equivalent, when that is an issue under criterion 3; and (5) the degree of specialization and complexity of the specific duties, which is the focus of criterion 4.⁹

Accordingly, as the petitioner has not established that it has satisfied any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it cannot be found that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed and the petition will be denied on this basis.

VI. Conclusion

As set forth above, the AAO agrees with the director's findings that the evidence of record has failed: (1) to demonstrate the existence of an employer-employee relationship between the petitioner and the beneficiary; (2) to establish that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation; and (3) to submit a valid Labor Condition Application (LCA) for all work locations when it filed the petition. Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has also failed to demonstrate that it had secured work for the entire period of requested employment when it filed the petition.

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 *Soltanè v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

Moreover, when the AAO denies a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge only if it shows that the AAO abused its discretion with respect to all of the AAO's enumerated grounds. See *Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1043, *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683.

⁹ Furthermore, even if the proffered position were established as being that of a systems analyst, a review of the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL's) *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (the *Handbook*) does not indicate that, as a category, such a position qualifies as a specialty occupation in that the *Handbook* does not state a normal minimum requirement of a U.S. bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into the occupation of programmer analyst. See U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2012-13 ed., "Computer Systems Analysts," <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-systems-analysts.htm#tab-2> (accessed Nov. 5, 2013). As such, absent evidence that the position of systems analyst satisfies one of the alternative criteria available under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), the instant petition could not be approved for this additional reason.

The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternate basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

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