



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)



**JUN 19 2015**

DATE:

PETITION RECEIPT #:



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:



Enclosed is the non-precedent decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for your case.

If you believe we incorrectly decided your case, you may file a motion requesting us to reconsider our decision and/or reopen the proceeding. The requirements for motions are located at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Motions must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) **within 33 days of the date of this decision**. The Form I-290B web page ([www.uscis.gov/i-290b](http://www.uscis.gov/i-290b)) contains the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. **Please do not mail any motions directly to the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, California Service Center, denied the petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

## I. PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The petitioner submitted a Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129) to the California Service Center. In the Form I-129 visa petition and supporting documentation, the petitioner describes itself as a computer software development and consulting company that was established in [REDACTED]. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a software engineer position, 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 reviewed the information and determined that the petitioner had not established eligibility for the benefit sought. The Director denied the petition, finding that the petitioner did not establish (1) that it will be a "United States employer" having an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary as an H-1B temporary employee; and (2) that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions.

The record of proceeding contains: (1) the petitioner's Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the Director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the Director's decision; and (5) the Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) and supporting documentation. We reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing our decision.<sup>1</sup>

For the reasons that will be discussed below, we agree with the Director's decision that the petitioner did not establish eligibility for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the Director's decision will not be disturbed. The appeal will be dismissed.

## II. THE PROFFERED POSITION

In the Form I-129 petition, the petitioner indicated that it is seeking the beneficiary's services as a software engineer on a full-time basis. In addition, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary would work at [REDACTED] which is located at [REDACTED] Colorado [REDACTED]. In the letter of support, the petitioner provided the following description of the proffered position:

[P]erform architectural design and development of [the petitioner's] proprietary [REDACTED] software for data warehousing and data mining, using Microsoft SQL Server, SQL Server Integration Services (SSIS), Microsoft SQL Server Analysis Services (SSAS), PowerView and SharePoint; use knowledge of Microsoft Dynamics AX 2012 to develop [REDACTED] create reports using SQL Server Reporting Services

<sup>1</sup> We conduct appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

(SSRS); perform research and development tasks; design and develop data warehouse; develop ETL and design cube; design and develop dashboards using SSRS, Power Pivot, PowerView and SharePoint 2010[.]

### III. LACK OF STANDING TO FILE THE PETITION

We will now address whether the petitioner has established that it meets the regulatory definition of a "United States employer" as that term is defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). We reviewed the record of proceeding to 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." *Id.*

More specifically, 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 (emphasis added):

*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.

8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii); *see also* 56 Fed. Reg. 61111, 61121 (Dec. 2, 1991). In the instant case, the record is not persuasive in establishing that the petitioner 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 an LCA with the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 212(n)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1). 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). 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 former 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. 440, 445 (2003) (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.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 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).

<sup>3</sup> 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))).

Accordingly, 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).<sup>4</sup> 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 weigh each actual factor itself as it exists or will exist and not the claimed employer's right to

---

<sup>4</sup> 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).

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).

The petitioner claims that it will have an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary. We have considered this assertion within the context of the record of proceeding. We examined each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 375-376. However, as will be discussed, there is insufficient probative evidence in the record to support this assertion. 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)). Applying the *Darden* and *Clackamas* tests to this matter, 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."

#### A. Inconsistencies in the Record

As will be discussed, we observe numerous inconsistencies and discrepancies in the petition and supporting documents, which collectively serve to undermine the petitioner's credibility with regard to several aspects of the beneficiary's claimed employment. When a petition includes numerous discrepancies, those inconsistencies will raise serious concerns about the veracity of the petitioner's assertions. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988).

##### 1. The Beneficiary's Work Site

We find that the petitioner has provided inconsistent information regarding the beneficiary's work site. For instance, in the Form I-129 (page 4), the petitioner indicates that the beneficiary will work at [REDACTED], which is located at [REDACTED], Colorado [REDACTED]. However, in the letter of support and in the offer of employment letter, the petitioner states that the beneficiary "may also be placed at [the petitioner's] headquarters, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] or at [the petitioner's] [REDACTED] office, located at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]." Further, the petitioner states that the beneficiary "may be placed at the client site of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. In addition, the itinerary indicates that the beneficiary will work in [REDACTED] Colorado from October

1, 2014, to October 1, 2017, and in [REDACTED] New Jersey, [REDACTED] Rhode Island and [REDACTED], Pennsylvania, on an as-needed basis. While the petitioner's statement indicating that the beneficiary's work location would vary as needed is acknowledged, that statement alone, absent additional evidence, is not sufficient.

## 2. The Beneficiary's Supervisor

In addition, we note that there are inconsistencies in the record of proceeding with regard to the beneficiary's supervisor. For example, in the letter of support, the petitioner states that the beneficiary will report to its Vice President, [REDACTED]. However, further in the letter, the petitioner states that "[i]f he is placed occasionally at [REDACTED] he will report to, and be closely supervised by our Senior Vice President, [REDACTED]." In addition, the petitioner's organizational chart, which was submitted with the initial petition, shows that the beneficiary will report to [REDACTED] Senior Software Engineer.

### B. Itinerary

According to the petitioner, the beneficiary will work off-site as a software engineer. As previously noted, the petitioner has provided inconsistent information regarding the beneficiary's work site. The itinerary indicates that the beneficiary will be assigned to work at [REDACTED] office in [REDACTED] Colorado from October 1, 2014, to October 1, 2017. The itinerary also indicates that the beneficiary will work at the petitioner's offices in [REDACTED] New Jersey and [REDACTED] Rhode Island, and [REDACTED] Pennsylvania. However, the itinerary does not include the start dates and end dates for these locations but, instead, indicates "[a]s needed." Thus, the itinerary does not indicate an intention by the petitioner to employ the beneficiary at [REDACTED] facility for the duration of the requested H-1B period.

### C. Offer of Employment Letter

For H-1B classification, the petitioner is required to submit written contracts between the petitioner and the beneficiary, or if there is no written agreement, a summary of the terms of the oral agreement under which the beneficiary will be employed. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv)(A) and (B). With the Form I-129 petition, the petitioner submitted an offer of employment letter dated March 26, 2014. As previously discussed, the letter indicates that the beneficiary will not serve exclusively on the project for [REDACTED] for the duration of his employment, but rather that he will be assigned to additional projects.

In addition, the employment letter references "benefits" for the beneficiary, but does not provide any description of the benefits or the eligibility requirements to obtain them. We note that the petitioner submitted copies of its "Premium Statements" from [REDACTED]. However, a substantive determination cannot be made or inferred regarding any "benefits" that may or may not be available to the beneficiary, as information regarding them, including eligibility requirements, was not submitted. While an employment agreement may provide some insights into the relationship of a petitioner and a beneficiary, it must be noted again that 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.

#### D. Duration of the Relationship Between the Parties

Further, upon review of the record, we note that the petitioner has not established the duration of the relationship between the parties. More specifically, on the Form I-129, the petitioner requested that the beneficiary be granted H-1B classification from October 1, 2014, to October 1, 2017. The record does not contain a written agreement between the petitioner and [REDACTED] or any other organization, establishing that H-1B caliber work exists for the beneficiary for the duration of the requested period.

The petitioner submitted Statements of Work (SOW) between itself and [REDACTED]. While the SOWs provide general descriptions as to the work to be performed by the petitioner, the documentation does not specify the beneficiary's duties and responsibilities. The petitioner also submitted a "Fourth Amendment to Exhibit D of Professional Services Statement of Work" between itself and [REDACTED] on appeal. However, we observe that neither the beneficiary nor the proffered position is listed in the document. The SOWs and the Fourth Amendment document do not establish that H-1B caliber work exists for the beneficiary, and the petitioner did not submit probative evidence establishing other projects or specific work for the beneficiary.

Although the petitioner requested the beneficiary be granted H-1B classification from October 1, 2014, to October 1, 2017, there is a lack of substantive documentation regarding any work for the duration of the requested period. Rather than establish non-speculative employment for the beneficiary for the entire period requested, the petitioner claims that "[e]ven if the project with [REDACTED] should end the petitioner has more than enough work for the beneficiary." However, the petitioner did not submit probative evidence in support of its claim. Moreover, the petitioner's statement is not corroborated by documentation indicating that an ongoing project exists that will generate employment for the beneficiary's services (e.g., documentary evidence regarding the project scope, staging, time and resource requirements; supporting contract negotiations; documentation regarding the business analysis and planning for specific work; statement of work; work order).

#### E. Instrumentalities and Tools

As previously noted, when making a determination of whether the petitioner has established that it has or will have an employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary, we look at a number of factors, including who will provide the instrumentalities and tools required to perform the specialty occupation. In the instant case, the Director specifically noted this factor in the RFE. Moreover, the Director provided examples of evidence for the petitioner to submit to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, which included documentation regarding the source of the instrumentalities and tools needed to perform the job. In its letter of support and in response to the Director's RFE, the petitioner stated that it "will provide the beneficiary [the beneficiary] with an assigned office space, a laptop, a cell phone, and downloads of [the petitioner's] proprietary software applications and systems, as well as updates and 24/7 support from the Offshore Lab." The petitioner did not provide

any further information on this matter. The petitioner did not fully address or submit probative evidence on the issue.

#### F. Supervision

In addition, a key element in this matter is who would have the ability to hire, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiary for the duration of the H-1B petition. As previously discussed, the petitioner has provided inconsistent information as to who will supervise the beneficiary. We incorporate by reference the prior discussion on the matter. In the letter of support, the petitioner claims that the beneficiary will be supervised by Mr. [REDACTED] while at [REDACTED] and by Mr. [REDACTED] while at [REDACTED]. The petitioner further claims that Mr. [REDACTED] and Mr. [REDACTED] visit the work sites on a regular basis, and when they are not there, they will keep in touch with the beneficiary via telephone and email. Aside from the itinerary and offer of employment letter, the petitioner has not provided any evidence corroborating its claims.

#### G. Lack of Evidence

In the RFE, the Director also asked the petitioner to provide information regarding the beneficiary's role in hiring and paying assistants. The petitioner elected not to address this issue or provide any information in response to this material request for evidence. While the petitioner was given an opportunity to clarify the beneficiary's role in hiring and paying assistants, it chose not to submit any probative evidence on the issue. 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).

#### H. Conclusion

We find that, while the petitioner may be able to eventually locate some work for the beneficiary, it did not establish that the petition was filed for non-speculative work for the beneficiary that existed *as of the time of the petition's filing*.<sup>5</sup> There is insufficient documentary evidence in the record

---

<sup>5</sup> 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

corroborating the availability of work for the beneficiary for the requested period of employment and, consequently, what the beneficiary would do, where the beneficiary would work, as well as how this would impact the circumstances of his relationship with the petitioner. 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)(1). A visa petition may not be approved based on speculation of future eligibility or after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. See *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm'r 1978). Moreover, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act. The petitioner did not establish that, at the time the petition was submitted, it had located H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary that would entail performing the duties as described in the petition, and that was reserved for the beneficiary for the duration of the period requested.

Upon complete review of the record of proceeding, we find that the evidence in this matter 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 that the petitioner exercises control over the beneficiary, without evidence supporting the claim, does not establish eligibility in this matter. 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. 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).

Moreover, there is a lack of probative evidence to support the petitioner's assertions. It cannot be concluded, therefore, that the petitioner has satisfied its burden and established that it qualifies as a United States employer with standing to file the instant petition in this matter. See section 214(c)(1) of the Act (requiring an "Importing Employer"); 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(A) (stating that the "United States employer . . . must file" the petition); 56 Fed. Reg. 61111, 61112 (Dec. 2, 1991) (explaining that only "United States employers can file an H-1B petition" and adding the definition of that term at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as clarification). Accordingly, the petition must be denied on this basis.

#### IV. 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(s) in order to properly

---

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).

ascertain the minimum educational requirements necessary to perform those duties. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). In other words, as the employees in that case would provide services to the end-client 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 regarding the specific job duties to be performed by the beneficiary. The petitioner'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.

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. Therefore, the Director's decision is affirmed and the petition must be denied for this reason.

#### V. BEYOND THE DIRECTOR'S DECISION

Moreover, we will now address another basis for denial of the petition. More specifically, we find that the petitioner did not comply with the itinerary requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) states, in pertinent part:

*Service or training in more than one location.* A petition that 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 USCIS as provided in the form instructions. The address that the petitioner specifies as its location on the Form I-129 shall be where the petitioner is located for purposes of this paragraph.

The itinerary language at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B), with its use of the mandatory "must" and its inclusion in the subsection "Filing of petitions," establishes that the itinerary as there defined is a material and necessary document for an H-1B petition involving employment at multiple locations, and that such a petition may not be approved for any employment period for which there is not submitted at least the employment dates and locations. Here, there is a lack of documentary evidence sufficient to corroborate the claim that the beneficiary would be serving as a software

engineer at [REDACTED] facility for the period sought in the petition. Although the petitioner requested the beneficiary be granted H-1B classification until October 1, 2017, the petitioner did not substantiate the proposed employment at [REDACTED] for the duration of the period requested. Thus, it appears that the beneficiary will work at multiple locations at some point during the requested period of employment. Although the petitioner provided an itinerary with the Form I-129 petition, the itinerary did not include the dates of the beneficiary's services at the multiple locations. Thus, the petition must also be denied on this additional basis.

## VI. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

An application or petition that does not comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by us 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).

Moreover, when we deny a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge only if it shows that we abused our discretion with respect to all of the enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1037, *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683; *see also BDPCS, Inc. v. Fed. Communications Comm'n*, 351 F.3d 1177, 1183 (D.C. Cir. 2003) ("When an agency offers multiple grounds for a decision, we will affirm the agency so long as any one of the grounds is valid, unless it is demonstrated that the agency would not have acted on that basis if the alternative grounds were unavailable.").

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative 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.