



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: **JUN 20 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:

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director initially approved the nonimmigrant visa petition. In response to new evidence, the director issued a notice of intent to revoke (NOIR), and ultimately did revoke the approval of the petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. Approval of the petition will remain revoked.

I. PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The petition was filed at the California Service Center on February 10, 2012, seeking to classify the beneficiary as an H-1B temporary 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) in order to employ him in what the petitioner designates as a Sr. SAP Technical Consultant position.

The director approved the visa petition on May 24, 2012. However, on March 7, 2013, the service center director issued a notice of intent to revoke (NOIR) in this matter. The petitioner's response was received on April 8, 2013. Subsequently, on May 16, 2013, the director revoked approval of the visa petition. The petitioner filed a timely appeal on June 12, 2013.

In the NOIR, the director stated that USCIS intended to revoke approval of the visa petition because the evidence indicated that the beneficiary was no longer employed in the capacity specified in the visa petition. After according the petitioner an opportunity to respond, the director revoked approval of the visa petition, finding that the petitioner had not overcome the grounds for revocation.

We have determined that the director did not err in her decision to revoke approval of the petition. Accordingly, the director's decision will not be disturbed. The appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will remain revoked.

We base our decision upon our review of the entire record of proceeding, which includes: (1) the petitioner's Form I-129 and the supporting documentation filed with it; (2) the service center's notice of intent to revoke (NOIR); (3) the response to the NOIR; (4) the director's revocation letter; and (5) the Form I-290B and counsel's submissions on appeal.

II. EVIDENCE

After the petition's approval, the director issued a NOIR to the petitioner, stating that USCIS had obtained new information regarding the beneficiary's employment with the petitioner.

Specifically, the NOIR states that an administrative site visit was performed on August 29, 2012, which determined that the beneficiary was not working at [REDACTED] which was the address listed on the petition as the location where the beneficiary would work. The USCIS sent a follow-up e-mail to the petitioner on September 28, 2012 requesting that the petitioner verify the beneficiary's employment at the [REDACTED] worksite. The petitioner's Director of HR & Operations responded with an e-mail, stating that the beneficiary was

no longer working at the address specified in the visa petition, but was working at the location of another client, [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. She stated that the beneficiary's job at that location would be "SAP Technical Consultant."

After issuing the NOIR, the director offered the petitioner an opportunity to respond. In response, counsel submitted a letter, dated April 2, 2013, in which he stated that the beneficiary was no longer working at the Kansas address, but was instead working at the Connecticut address. Counsel stated that the petitioner has a valid LCA for the Connecticut address and asserted that the change of location did not require an amended visa petition.

III. LAW AND ANALYSIS

USCIS may revoke the approval of an H-1B petition pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(11)(iii), which states the following:

- (A) Grounds for revocation. The director shall send to the petitioner a notice of intent to revoke the petition in relevant part if he or she finds that:
- (1) The beneficiary is no longer employed by the petitioner in the capacity specified in the petition, or if the beneficiary is no longer receiving training as specified in the petition; or
 - (2) The statement of facts contained in the petition was not true and correct, inaccurate, fraudulent, or misrepresented a material fact; or
 - (3) The petitioner violated terms and conditions of the approved petition; or
 - (4) The petitioner violated requirements of section 101(a)(15)(H) of the Act or paragraph (h) of this section; or
 - (5) The approval of the petition violated paragraph (h) of this section or involved gross error.

¹ The AAO notices that [REDACTED] has a location at [REDACTED]. Various companies named [REDACTED] have locations in various countries, including numerous locations in the United States. None of those locations, however, are in Connecticut. Although the petitioner's e-mail does not sufficiently explain the relationship of the petitioner to [REDACTED] appears to be an intermediary contractor through which the petitioner provided the beneficiary to [REDACTED].

- (B) Notice and decision. The notice of intent to revoke shall contain a detailed statement of the grounds for the revocation and the time period allowed for the petitioner's rebuttal. The petitioner may submit evidence in rebuttal within 30 days of receipt of the notice. The director shall consider all relevant evidence presented in deciding whether to revoke the petition in whole or in part. If the petition is revoked in part, the remainder of the petition shall remain approved and a revised approval notice shall be sent to the petitioner with the revocation notice.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(E) states:

Amended or new petition. The petitioner shall file an amended or new petition, with fee, with the Service Center where the original petition was filed to reflect any material changes in the terms and conditions of employment or training or the alien's eligibility as specified in the original approved petition. An amended or new H-1C, H-1B, H-2A, or H-2B petition must be accompanied by a current or new Department of Labor determination. In the case of an H-1B petition, this requirement includes a new labor condition application.

It is self-evident that a change in the location of a beneficiary's work to a geographical area not covered by the LCA filed with the Form I-129 is a material change in the terms and conditions of employment. Because work locations are critical to the petitioner's wage rate obligations, the change deprives the petition of an LCA supporting the periods of work to be performed at the new location and certified on or before the date the instant petition was filed. While the petitioner claims to have a newly certified LCA listing the Connecticut work location and the respective dates of employment, the petitioner in this case was required to submit an amended or new H-1B petition with USCIS indicating the change in location and dates along with the newly certified LCA that establishes eligibility at the time that new or amended petition is filed.

While DOL is the agency that certifies LCA applications before they are submitted to USCIS, DOL regulations note that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (i.e., its immigration benefits branch, USCIS) is the department responsible for determining whether the content of an LCA filed for a particular Form I-129 actually supports that petition. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b), which states, in pertinent part:

For H-1B visas . . . DHS accepts the employer's petition (DHS Form I-129) with the DOL-certified LCA attached. *In doing so, the DHS determines whether the petition is supported by an LCA which corresponds with the petition*, whether the occupation named in the [LCA] is a specialty occupation or whether the individual is a fashion model of distinguished merit and ability, and whether the qualifications of the nonimmigrant meet the statutory requirements of H-1B visa classification.

[emphasis added]. As 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b) requires that USCIS ensure that an H-1B petition is filed with a "DOL-certified LCA attached" that actually supports and corresponds with the petition

on the petition's filing, this regulation inherently necessitates the filing of an amended H-1B petition to permit USCIS to perform its regulatory duty to ensure that a certified LCA actually supports and corresponds with an H-1B petition as of the date of that petition's filing. In addition, as 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1) requires eligibility to be established at the time of filing, it is factually impossible for an LCA certified by DOL after the filing of an initial H-1B petition to establish eligibility at the time the initial petition was filed. Therefore, in order for a petitioner to comply with 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1) and USCIS to perform its regulatory duties under 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b), a petitioner must file an amended or new petition, with fee, whenever a beneficiary's job location changes such that a new LCA is required to be filed with DOL.

It is further noted that to ascertain the intent of a petitioner, USCIS must look to the Form I-129 and the documents filed in support of the petition. It is only in this manner that the agency can determine the exact position offered, the location of employment, the proffered wage, et cetera. If a petitioner's intent changes with regard to a material term and condition of employment or the beneficiary's eligibility, an amended or new petition must be filed. To allow a petition to be amended in any other way would be contrary to the regulations. Taken to the extreme, a petitioner could then simply claim to offer what is essentially speculative employment when filing the petition only to "change its intent" after the fact, either before or after the H-1B petition has been adjudicated. The agency made clear long ago that speculative employment is not permitted in the H-1B program. For example, 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 (June 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).

The petitioner has not demonstrated that it continues to employ the beneficiary in the capacity specified in the visa petition, and the petition will remain revoked pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(11)(iii)(A)(I).

IV. CONCLUSION

As discussed above, the AAO agrees with the director's grounds for revoking the approval of this petition. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed, and approval of the petition will remain revoked.

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.