






U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




DATE: FEB 27 2015 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 (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,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner submitted a Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129) to the California Service Center. In the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as enterprise engaged in software development that was established in [REDACTED]. The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary 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, finding that the petitioner did not establish (1) that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation and that it has sufficient work for the requested period of intended employment, and (2) that it would have an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. On appeal, the petitioner asserts that the director's grounds for denial were erroneous and contends that it satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

A review of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records indicates that subsequent to the submission of the appeal, another employer filed a Form I-129 petition seeking nonimmigrant H-1B classification on behalf of the beneficiary. USCIS records further indicate that this other employer's petition was approved. Because the beneficiary in the instant petition has been approved for H-1B employment with another petitioner, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.