



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the
Administrative Appeals Office**

MATTER OF M- LLC

DATE: OCT. 4, 2016

APPEAL OF VERMONT SERVICE CENTER DECISION

PETITION: FORM I-129, PETITION FOR A NONIMMIGRANT WORKER

The Petitioner, a software consultancy, seeks to temporarily employ the Beneficiary as a “programmer analyst” under the H-1B nonimmigrant classification for specialty occupations. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). The H-1B program allows a U.S. employer to temporarily employ a qualified foreign worker in a position that requires both (a) the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge and (b) the attainment of a bachelor’s or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum prerequisite for entry into the position.

The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the petition. The Director concluded that the Petitioner had not established that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

The matter is now before us on appeal. In its appeal, the Petitioner submits additional evidence and asserts that the evidence in the record satisfies all evidentiary requirements.

Upon *de novo* review, we will dismiss the appeal.

I. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term “specialty occupation” as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) attainment of a bachelor’s or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) largely restates this statutory definition, but adds a non-exhaustive list of fields of endeavor. In addition, the regulations provide that the proffered position must meet one of the following criteria to qualify as a specialty occupation:

- (1) A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
- (2) The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
- (3) The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
- (4) The nature of the specific duties [is] so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has consistently interpreted the term “degree” in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proposed position. See *Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007) (describing “a degree requirement in a specific specialty” as “one that relates directly to the duties and responsibilities of a particular position”); *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 387 (5th Cir. 2000).

II. PROFFERED POSITION

In the H-1B petition, the Petitioner stated that the Beneficiary will serve as a “programmer analyst.” The Petitioner provided the following duty description for the proffered position (note: errors in the original text have not been changed):

- Provide application software development service and technical support as defined in the project scope.
- Will have complete ownership and responsibility of all deliverables overcoming obstacles as needed
- Conduct planning and analysis activities to plan projects and tasks
- Analyze requirements, and translate business requirements into technical design solutions.
- Develop program logic in existing applications
- Code, unit test, implement, prepare documentation, debug and maintain software applications
- Maintain, test and integrate application component.
- Ensure that system improvements are successfully implemented.
- Write technical specifications and other forms of documentation
- Suggest technical alternatives and improves/streamlines processes and systems
- Complete project assignments and special projects commensurate with job expectations.

The Petitioner stated that the Beneficiary would spend 25 percent of his time performing systems analysis; 20 percent of his time performing system design; 30 percent of his time writing source code and developing programs; 15 percent of his time performing unit and system testing; and 10 percent of his time performing system installation.

In a declaration submitted in response to a request for evidence (RFE), the Petitioner provided the same list of duties.

According to the Petitioner, the proffered position requires a bachelor's degree in computer science, engineering, or a related discipline.

III. ANALYSIS

Upon review of the record in its totality and for the reasons set out below, we determine that the Petitioner has not demonstrated that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.¹ Specifically, the record does not establish that the job duties require an educational background, or its equivalent, commensurate with a specialty occupation.²

A. First Criterion

We turn first to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I), which requires that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position. To inform this inquiry, we recognize the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.³

On the labor condition application (LCA) submitted in support of the H-1B petition, the Petitioner designated the proffered position under the occupational category "Computer Systems Analysts" corresponding to the Standard Occupational Classification code 15-1121.⁴

¹ Although some aspects of the regulatory criteria may overlap, we will address each of the criteria individually.

² The Petitioner submitted documentation to support the H-1B petition, including evidence regarding the proffered position and its business operations. While we may not discuss every document submitted, we have reviewed and considered each one.

³ All of our references are to the 2016-2017 edition of the *Handbook*, which may be accessed at the Internet site <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/>. We do not, however, maintain that the *Handbook* is the exclusive source of relevant information. That is, the occupational category designated by the Petitioner is considered as an aspect in establishing the general tasks and responsibilities of a proffered position, and USCIS regularly reviews the *Handbook* on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses. To satisfy the first criterion, however, the burden of proof remains on the Petitioner to submit sufficient evidence to support a finding that its particular position would normally have a minimum, specialty degree requirement, or its equivalent, for entry.

⁴ The Petitioner classified the proffered position at a Level I wage (the lowest of four assignable wage levels). We will consider this selection in our analysis of the position. The "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance" issued by the DOL provides a description of the wage levels. A Level I wage rate is generally appropriate for positions for which

In the chapter entitled “Computer Systems Analysts,” the *Handbook* states the following with regard to the requirements of systems analyst positions:

Most computer systems analysts have a bachelor’s degree in a computer-related field. Because these analysts also are heavily involved in the business side of a company, it may be helpful to take business courses or major in management information systems.

Some employers prefer applicants who have a master’s degree in business administration (MBA) with a concentration in information systems. For more technically complex jobs, a master’s degree in computer science may be more appropriate.

Although many computer systems analysts have technical degrees, such a degree is not always a requirement. Many analysts have liberal arts degrees and have gained programming or technical expertise elsewhere.

U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2016-17 ed., “Computer Systems Analysts,” <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-systems-analysts.htm#tab-4> (last visited Sept. 29, 2016).

The *Handbook* does not support the assertion that at least a bachelor’s degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for these positions. This section of the narrative begins by stating that a bachelor’s degree in a related field is not a requirement. The *Handbook* continues by stating that there is a wide-range of degrees that are acceptable for positions in this occupation, including general purpose degrees such as business and liberal arts. While the *Handbook* indicates that a bachelor’s degree in a computer or information science field is common, it does not report that such a degree is normally a minimum requirement for entry.

According to the *Handbook*, many systems analysts have liberal arts degrees and have gained programming or technical expertise elsewhere. It further reports that many analysts have technical degrees. We observe that the *Handbook* does not specify a degree level (e.g., associate’s degree, baccalaureate) for these technical degrees. Moreover, it specifically states that such a degree is not always a requirement. Thus, the *Handbook* does not support the claim that the occupational

the Petitioner expects the Beneficiary to have a basic understanding of the occupation. This wage rate indicates: (1) that the Beneficiary will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; (2) that he will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and (3) that he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Emp’t & Training Admin., *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagric. Immigration Programs (rev. Nov. 2009), available at http://flcdatacenter.com/download/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf. A prevailing wage determination starts with an entry level wage and progresses to a higher wage level after considering the experience, education, and skill requirements of the Petitioner’s job opportunity. *Id.*

category of computer systems analyst is one for which normally the minimum requirement for entry is a baccalaureate degree (or higher) in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Even if it did, the record lacks sufficient evidence to support a finding that the particular position proffered here, an entry-level computer systems analyst position, would normally have such a minimum, specialty degree requirement or its equivalent.

We note that, in the decision of denial, the Director stated, “. . . USCIS acknowledges that the position of programmer analyst is traditionally consider a specialty occupation.” To the extent that this might be taken to mean that programmer analyst positions or computer systems analyst positions qualify, as a category, for specialty occupation treatment, that portion of the decision is withdrawn.

Further, in designating the proffered position at a Level I wage, the Petitioner has indicated that the proffered position is a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupation. That is, in accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels, this wage rate indicates that the Beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation and carries expectations that the Beneficiary perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he would be closely supervised; that his work would be closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he would receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. As noted above, according to DOL guidance, a statement that the job offer is for a research fellow, worker in training or an internship is indicative that a Level I wage should be considered.

When the *Handbook* does not support the proposition that a proffered position is one that meets the statutory and regulatory provisions of a specialty occupation, it is incumbent upon the Petitioner to provide persuasive evidence that the proffered position more likely than not satisfies this or one of the other three criteria, notwithstanding the absence of the *Handbook*'s support on the issue. In such cases, it is the petitioner's responsibility to provide probative evidence (e.g., documentation from other objective, authoritative sources) that supports a finding that the particular position in question qualifies as a specialty occupation. Whenever more than one authoritative source exists, an adjudicator will consider and weigh all of the evidence presented to determine whether the particular position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

However, in this case, the record of proceedings does not contain sufficient persuasive documentary evidence from any other relevant authoritative source establishing that the proffered position's inclusion within the “Computer Systems Analysts” occupational category establishes the proffered position as, in the words of this criterion, a “particular position” for which “[a] baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry.”

Further, we find that, to the extent that they are described in the record of proceedings, the numerous duties that the Petitioner ascribes to the proffered position indicate a need for a range of technical knowledge in the computer/IT field, but do not establish any particular level of formal, postsecondary education leading to a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty as minimally necessary to attain such knowledge.

For the reasons explained above, the Petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

B. Second Criterion

The second criterion presents two, alternative prongs: “The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations *or, in the alternative*, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree[.]” 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) (emphasis added). The first prong casts its gaze upon the common industry practice, while the alternative prong narrows its focus to the Petitioner’s specific position.

1. First Prong

To satisfy this first prong of the second criterion, the Petitioner must establish that the “degree requirement” (i.e., a requirement of a bachelor’s or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent) is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations.

In determining whether there is such a common degree requirement, factors often considered by USCIS include: whether the *Handbook* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry’s professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms “routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals.” See *Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1165 (D. Minn. 1999) (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

Here and as already discussed, the Petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* (or other independent, authoritative source) reports an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor’s degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Thus, we incorporate by reference the previous discussion on the matter. Also, there are no submissions from the industry’s professional association indicating that it has made a degree a minimum entry requirement. Furthermore, the Petitioner did not submit any letters or affidavits from similar firms or individuals in the Petitioner’s industry attesting that such firms “routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals.” Nor is there any other evidence for our consideration under this prong. Thus, the Petitioner has not satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

2. Second Prong

We will next consider the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), which is satisfied if the Petitioner shows that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with at least a bachelor’s degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

A review of the record of proceedings finds that the Petitioner has not credibly demonstrated that the duties the Beneficiary will be responsible for or perform on a day-to-day basis constitute a position

so complex or unique that it can only be performed by a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Even when considering the Petitioner's general descriptions of the proffered position's duties, the evidence of record does not establish why a few related courses or industry experience alone is insufficient preparation for the proffered position. While a few related courses may be beneficial, or even required, in performing certain duties of the position, the Petitioner has not demonstrated how an established curriculum of such courses leading to a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform the duties of the proffered position. The description of the duties does not specifically identify any tasks that are so complex or unique that only a specifically degreed individual could perform them. The record lacks sufficiently detailed information to distinguish the proffered position as more complex or unique from other positions that can be performed by persons without at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

This is further evidenced by the LCA submitted by the Petitioner in support of the instant petition. While the Petitioner's claims with regarding the complexity of the position are acknowledged, the Petitioner also attested on the LCA that the proper wage level for the proffered position would be a Level I (entry-level) wage. However, that wage level is for a position which only requires a basic understanding of the occupation; the performance of routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; close supervision and work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and the receipt of specific instructions on required tasks and expected results, is contrary to a position that requires the performance of complex duties.⁵ It is, instead, a position for an employee who has only basic understanding of the occupation. In order to attempt to show that parallel positions require a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent, the Petitioner would be obliged to demonstrate that other wage Level I computer systems analyst positions, entry-level positions requiring only a basic understanding of computer systems analysis, require a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent, the proposition of which is not supported by the *Handbook*.

Therefore, the evidence of record does not establish that this position is significantly different from other positions in the occupation such that it refutes the *Handbook's* information to the effect that there is a spectrum of degrees acceptable for such positions, including degrees not in a specific specialty. In other words, the record lacks sufficiently detailed information to distinguish the proffered position as unique from or more complex than positions that can be performed by persons without at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

⁵ The issue here is that the Petitioner's designation of this position as a Level I, entry-level position undermines its claim that the position is particularly complex, specialized, or unique compared to other positions *within the same occupation*. Nevertheless, it is important to note that a Level I wage-designation does not preclude a proffered position from classification as a specialty occupation. In certain occupations (doctors or lawyers, for example), an entry-level position would still require a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for entry. Similarly, however, a Level IV wage-designation would not reflect that an occupation qualifies as a specialty occupation if that higher-level position does not have an entry requirement of at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. That is, a position's wage level designation may be a consideration but is not a substitute for a determination of whether a proffered position meets the requirements of section 214(i)(1) of the Act.

As the Petitioner did not demonstrate how the proffered position is so complex or unique relative to other positions within the same occupational category that do not require at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into the occupation in the United States, it cannot be concluded that the Petitioner has satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

C. Third Criterion

The third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) entails an employer demonstrating that it normally requires a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the position. To this end, we usually review a petitioner's past recruiting and hiring practices; as well as information regarding employees who previously held the position.

The Petitioner has not expressly asserted eligibility nor submitted evidence for our consideration under this criterion. It did provide a portion of a vacancy announcement placed for a programmer analyst position at its Florida location. However, the excerpt provided did not state an educational requirement, and there is no indication as to whether anyone was ever hired as a result of this posting. In any event, as that position is located in Florida it is not clear if it is the same position as the one proffered here.

The Petitioner stated, on the H-1B petition, that it was established in 2014 and has 11 employees in the United States. However, it did not reveal whether it has ever hired someone to fill the proffered position or, if it has, what educational qualifications it required.

Absent evidence pertinent to the educational background of its previous hires, it is unclear how an employer would be able to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3), which requires a demonstration that it normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for the position. We cannot conclude that the Petitioner has satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).⁶

⁶ While a petitioner may believe or otherwise assert that a proffered position requires a degree in a specific specialty, that opinion alone without corroborating evidence cannot establish the position as a specialty occupation. Were USCIS limited solely to reviewing a petitioner's claimed self-imposed requirements, then any individual with a bachelor's degree could be brought to the United States to perform any occupation as long as the employer artificially created a token degree requirement, whereby all individuals employed in a particular position possessed a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty or its equivalent. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 387. In other words, if a petitioner's degree requirement is only symbolic and the proffered position does not in fact require such a specialty degree or its equivalent to perform its duties, the occupation would not meet the statutory or regulatory definition of a specialty occupation. *See* section 214(i)(1) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "specialty occupation").

D. Fourth Criterion

The fourth criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) requires a petitioner to establish that the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

In the instant case, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the Petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position. We again refer to our earlier comments and findings with regard to the implication of the Petitioner's designation of the proffered position in the LCA as a Level I (the lowest of four assignable levels) wage. That is, the Level I wage designation is indicative of a low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupational category, and hence one not likely distinguishable by relatively specialized and complex duties.

Upon review of the totality of the record, the Petitioner has not established that the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Therefore, the evidence of record does not satisfy the fourth criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Finally, while we acknowledge the Petitioner's citations to several unpublished decisions in which we determined that the programmer analyst positions proffered in those cases were specialty occupation positions, they are not persuasive. The Petitioner has furnished no evidence to establish that the facts of the instant petition are analogous to those in the unpublished decision. While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that our precedent decisions are binding on all USCIS employees in the administration of the Act, unpublished decisions are not similarly binding.

Because the Petitioner has not satisfied one of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it has not demonstrated that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

IV. ADDITIONAL BASES

As the Petitioner did not demonstrate that the proffered position is a specialty occupation, we need not fully address other issues evident in the record. That said, we wish to identify two additional issues to inform the Petitioner that these matters should be addressed in any future proceedings.⁷

⁷ In reviewing a matter *de novo*, we may identify additional issues not addressed below in the Director's 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) ("The AAO may deny an application or petition on a ground not identified by the Service Center.").

(b)(6)

Matter of M- LLC

A. Employer-Employee Relationship

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act defines an H-1B nonimmigrant, in pertinent part, as an individual:

[S]ubject 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:

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.

(Emphasis added); *see* Temporary Alien Workers Seeking Classification Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, 56 Fed. Reg. 61,111, 61,121 (Dec. 2, 1991) (to be codified at 8 C.F.R. pt. 214).

At issue is 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). Specifically, as the Petitioner has satisfied the first and third prongs of the definition of United States employer, the remaining question is 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." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

The H-1B petition states that the Beneficiary would work at the Petitioner's address in Florida. A Statement of Work in the record, ratified by both the [redacted] states: "[The Petitioner's workers] will be stationed at [redacted] headquarters at [redacted] WA or at any other location designated by [redacted]. In the balance of the record, however, the Petitioner indicates that the Beneficiary he would work at [redacted] in [redacted] Michigan, which other evidence shows to be a location of [redacted]. The LCA submitted to support the petition is certified for employment at the Petitioner's Florida location and at [redacted] Michigan location.

Matter of M- LLC

Although the Petitioner and [REDACTED] have repeatedly stated that the Petitioner would control the Beneficiary's work, the record contains insufficient evidence to corroborate that assertion. For example, the Petitioner claims to exert complete control over hiring and firing the Beneficiary. However, a letter from the Petitioner to the Beneficiary offering him employment states: "The joining [of the Beneficiary to the Petitioner] is contingent upon successful completion of the Client interview."

The record contains an Employee Performance Appraisal, which indicates that the Petitioner periodically performs a *pro forma* evaluation of its employees' performance. However, that evaluation consists chiefly of the employee's self-reporting. For instance, the first three items to which the employee responds are:

1. Briefly describe the nature of assignment, including the specific tasks and responsibilities, and the degree of difficulty of the assignment.
2. Briefly list two or three key results you achieved during this period.
3. Did you demonstrate the proper judgement and decision making skill while on the project? Yes

In the instant case, the Petitioner's supervision of the Beneficiary's performance appears to be limited to permitting the Beneficiary to provide a periodic report to the Petitioner. We observe that the third question appears to have been answered for the employee on the form itself.

The Petitioner, which is in Florida, claims that it intends to send the Beneficiary to work remotely in Michigan on a project under development at [REDACTED] location. The Petitioner does not appear to be managing the development of that project, and it is not clear that the Petitioner would assign a supervisor to that location to direct and oversee the Beneficiary's work. As noted, by virtue of its wage-level designation in the LCA, the Petitioner attested that the Beneficiary will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; (2) that he will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and (3) that he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. If the Petitioner will not send someone to provide this close level of supervision, then it is unclear who will, given the repeated claims that [REDACTED] will not. In any event, the record does not establish that the Petitioner, rather than [REDACTED] would assign the Beneficiary's tasks and supervise he performance of them. Assigning duties and supervising performance are central to an employer-employee relationship.

The current record does not establish that the Petitioner would 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). Absent that demonstration, the instant H-1B petition could not be approved.

(b)(6)

Matter of M- LLC

B. Corresponding LCA

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B)(1) stipulates the following:

Before filing a petition for H-1B classification in a specialty occupation, the petitioner shall obtain a certification from the Department of Labor that it has filed a labor condition application in the occupational specialty in which the alien(s) will be employed.

While DOL is the agency that certifies LCAs before they are submitted to USCIS, DOL regulations note that it is within the discretion of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (i.e., its immigration benefits branch, USCIS) to determine 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.)

The Petitioner indicated, on the H-1B petition, that it would employ the Beneficiary at its own location. The SOW in the record, however, states: "The [Petitioner's workers] will be stationed at [REDACTED] headquarters in [REDACTED] WA or at any other location designated by [REDACTED]. If that SOW pertains to the Beneficiary, then the Petitioner has delegated to [REDACTED] the right to assign the Beneficiary to work at any of its locations. For this reason, the Petitioner has not demonstrated that the location to which the Beneficiary would be assigned would correspond to one of the two locations for which the LCA is certified."⁸

Further, the Petitioner has stated that the proffered position is a wage Level I systems analyst position. However, the Petitioner will apparently not be assigning the Beneficiary's work. How the Petitioner determined that the Beneficiary would be assigned only wage Level I work, routine work for beginning level employees with only a basic understanding of systems analysis, requiring limited, if any, exercise of judgment, is unclear. The Petitioner has not demonstrated that, if the H-1B petition were approved, the Beneficiary would perform wage Level I computer systems analyst duties.

⁸ As was noted above, the LCA is certified for the location in [REDACTED] Michigan and the Petitioner's location in Florida.

Matter of M- LLC

Finally, many of the Petitioner's specific statements regarding the duties of the proffered position, such as its claim that the Beneficiary would "take complete ownership and responsibility of all deliverables," appear to conflict with its designation of the position at a Level I wage.

For all of these reasons, it is not clear that the certified LCA corresponds to and supports the H-1B petition.

V. CONCLUSION

The burden is on the Petitioner to show 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. The appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

Cite as *Matter of M- LLC*, ID# 124748 (AAO Oct. 4, 2016)