

(b)(6)



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

DATE: **AUG 04 2014** 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 (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,

for *Michael T. Kelly*
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 on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed, as the matter is moot.

On the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as a development and information technology services company established in 2005. In order to employ the beneficiary in a full-time position to which it assigned "Automation Engineer" as the job title, 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, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition on November 5, 2013, concluding that the evidence of record did not establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Counsel for the petitioner filed an appeal of the director's decision, which is now before us for review and determination.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records indicate that on November 29, 2013, a date subsequent to the denial of the instant petition, another employer filed a petition seeking nonimmigrant classification of the beneficiary under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act. USCIS records indicate further that this petition was approved on December 28, 2013, with dates of validity from December 24, 2013 through December 1, 2016. Because the beneficiary of the instant petition has been approved for H-1B employment with another petitioner based upon the filing of a subsequent petition, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.¹

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed as moot.

¹ It appears that the beneficiary may no longer have any intent to work for the petitioner, if, as the recent approval of the petition filed by a different employer suggests, the beneficiary has been granted authorization to work for another petitioner. If that is the case, it would render the controversy over the H-1B petition "no longer live." See *Wong v. Napolitano*, 654 F.Supp.2d 1184, 1192 (D. Or. 2009) (holding that "a live controversy requirement is provided by a present intent by both parties to enter into an employment relationship which is being thwarted by USCIS or some other party").