

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

D2



FILE: WAC 07 144 53642 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: AUG 04 2008

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a software development and training business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a computer software engineer. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors 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 (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). The director denied the petition determining that the petitioner had not established that a reasonable and credible offer of employment exists, that the petitioner qualifies as a U.S. employer or agent, that the proffered position is a specialty occupation, or that its labor condition application (LCA) is valid.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the 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 denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B, with the petitioner's brief and documentation in support of the appeal. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before reaching its decision.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii):

Specialty occupation means an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in field of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must meet one of the following criteria:

- (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.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), *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.

Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) interprets the term "degree" in the above criteria to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, CIS does not simply rely on a position's title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations, are factors to be considered. CIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000).

In an undated letter submitted in support of the petition, the petitioner described the proposed responsibilities and time allocations of the proffered computer software engineer position as follows:

- 1. Research, design, and develop computer software systems applying knowledge of computer theory and dynamic programming methods (40%);
- 2. Analyze software requirements to define need and feasibility of design within time and cost constraints (40%);
- 3. Expand, modify, and update existing programs to enhance their compatibility and functionality (10%); and

4. Evaluate interface between hardware and software systems to enhance their capability and functionality and simulation of future programs (10%).

The record also includes a certified LCA submitted at the time of filing listing the beneficiary's work location in Sterling Heights, Michigan as a computer software engineer.

In an RFE, the director requested additional information from the petitioner, including an itinerary and copies of contracts between the petitioner and its clients for whom the beneficiary would be performing services, along with any statements of work/work orders, and/or service agreements for the beneficiary.

In response to the RFE, the petitioner stated that it is the actual employer of the consultant, with responsibility for hiring, firing, payment of salary, and any related benefits owed to the employee. The petitioner also stated that the beneficiary will initially work at the petitioner's corporate offices in Sterling Heights, Michigan, providing services related to the development of business software, which will be marketed to the petitioner's clients and targeted business organizations, and ultimately modified, installed, and tested by the petitioner's consultants. As supporting documentation, the petitioner submitted: sample contracts between the petitioner and its clients; order confirmations for the petitioner's job advertisements; printouts from the petitioner's website; recognition of the petitioner as one of the winners of the "2006 Future 50 of Greater Detroit" awards competition for its positive impact on the economy of Southeast Michigan; and recognition of the petitioner by *Inc.* magazine as number 204 of the nation's 500 fastest-growing private companies.

The director denied the petition on the basis that, although the petitioner had submitted copies of its master contracts, it had not provided an itinerary or a contract between itself and the end-client for whom the beneficiary would provide her services. The director also found that, without such a contract or itinerary, the petitioner had not demonstrated that a reasonable and credible offer of employment exists, the petitioner qualifies as a U.S. employer or agent, the proffered position is a specialty occupation, or that its labor condition application (LCA) is valid.

On appeal, the petitioner states, in part, that, due to time constraints, there was previously no end-contract available, and that the petitioner is clearly the employer, as it has absolute control over the work and actions of the beneficiary. The petitioner also states that, as the proffered position is an in-house position, the location listed on the LCA submitted at the time of filing is correct. As supporting documentation, the petitioner submits a consulting/contracting service agreement, signed on August 2, 2007, between the petitioner and [REDACTED], located in Boca Raton, Florida, for the petitioner to provide IT consulting services to [REDACTED] in accordance with the assignments detailed on the attached "confirmation form"; and the contract of employment, dated March 1, 2007, between the petitioner and the beneficiary.

The AAO observes that the documentation submitted on appeal does not comply with the requirement that the petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978). In this matter, the consulting/contracting service agreement between the petitioner and Cendyn, located in Boca Raton, Florida,

is dated August 2, 2007, after the April 2, 2007 filing date of the petition. As stated in *Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm. 1998), "[t]he AAO cannot consider facts that come into being only subsequently to the filing of the petition."

Preliminarily, the AAO finds that the evidence of record is sufficient to establish that the petitioner will act as the beneficiary's employer in that it will hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of the beneficiary as set out in the petitioner's undated letter of support and the contract of employment, dated March 1, 2007, between the petitioner and the beneficiary.¹ See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

The Aytes memorandum cited at footnote 1, indicates that the director has the discretion to request that the employer who will employ the beneficiary in multiple locations submit an itinerary. Upon review, the director properly exercised her discretion to request additional information regarding the beneficiary's ultimate employment, as the petitioner indicated that the beneficiary would be working at the petitioner's site in Sterling Heights, Michigan and at undisclosed client sites. Although the AAO declines to find that the petitioner is acting as the beneficiary's agent, the petitioner in this matter is employing the beneficiary to work for its clients or its clients' clients, and thus can be described as an employment contractor.

When a petitioner is an employment contractor, the entity ultimately employing the alien or using the alien's services must submit a detailed job description of the duties that the alien will perform and the qualifications that are required to perform the job duties. *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). From this evidence, CIS will determine whether the duties require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.

In this matter, the petitioner does not provide substantive evidence that the duties of the proffered position incorporate the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge that requires the 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. Only a detailed job description from the entity that requires the alien's services will suffice to meet the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). The petitioner did not submit the requested evidence in the director's RFE pertaining to contracts, statements of work, work orders, and/or service agreements between the petitioner and its clients for whom the beneficiary would be performing services, along with any statements of work, work orders, or service agreements for the beneficiary. As discussed above, the consulting/contracting service agreement submitted on appeal, between the petitioner and Cendyn, located in Boca Raton, Florida, is dated August 2, 2007, after the April 2, 2007 filing date of the petition, and thus cannot be considered. Furthermore, even if the AAO were to consider this evidence, the petitioner still does not satisfy its burden of proof, as the contract does not pertain to the beneficiary. Nor has the petitioner submitted a corresponding "confirmation form" on

¹ See also Memorandum from Michael L. Aytes, Assistant Commissioner, INS Office of Adjudications, *Interpretation of the Term "Itinerary" Found in 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(2)(i)(B) as it Relates to the H-1B Nonimmigrant Classification*, HQ 70/6.2.8 (December 29, 1995).

which the specific nature of the beneficiary's assignment should be outlined, in accordance with the second item listed in the August 2, 2007 consulting/contracting service agreement. 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. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

In addition, on the first page of the petitioner's brief, the petitioner asserts that the beneficiary will work onsite for its client, Cendyn, which is located in Boca Raton, Florida, information that conflicts with the petitioner's assertion on the last page of the same brief that the proffered position is an in-house position at the petitioner's location in Sterling Heights, Michigan. The record contains no explanation for this inconsistency. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). 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). As the exact nature and location of the proffered position remains unclear, the AAO is precluded from determining whether the offered position is one that would normally impose the minimum of a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty. The record does not contain a detailed description of the work to be performed by the beneficiary for the end user of the beneficiary's services. Thus, the record does not contain evidence that a specialty occupation position existed when the petition was filed. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established the proffered position as a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(iii)(A)(I).

In that the record does not provide a sufficient job description from the end user of the beneficiary's services, the petitioner is also precluded from meeting the requirements of the three remaining alternate criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Without a job description detailing the specific duties, the petitioner may not establish the position's duties as parallel to any degreed positions within similar organizations in its industry or distinguish the position as more complex or unique than similar, but non-degreed, employment, as required by alternate prongs of the second criterion. Absent a descriptive listing of the software engineer duties the beneficiary would perform under contract, the petitioner cannot establish that it previously employed degreed individuals to perform such duties, as required by the third criterion. Neither can the petitioner satisfy the requirements of the fourth criterion by distinguishing the proffered position based on the specialization and complexity of its duties.

Upon review of the totality of the record, the record fails to reveal sufficient evidence that the offered position requires a bachelor's degree, or its equivalent, in a specific discipline. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(B), the petitioner shall submit the following with an H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation:

1. A certification from the Secretary of Labor that the petitioner has filed a labor condition application with the Secretary,
2. A statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application for the duration of the alien's authorized period of stay,
3. Evidence that the alien qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation. . . .

The director also found that, without contracts and work orders from the ultimate end-client for whom the beneficiary will provide her services, the name and location of the beneficiary's employment site is unclear, and thus the petitioner has not demonstrated compliance with the certified LCA. As discussed above, the petitioner did not submit the requested evidence in the director's RFE pertaining to contracts, statements of work, work orders, and/or service agreements between the petitioner and its clients for whom the beneficiary will be providing services, along with any statements of work, work orders, or service agreements for the beneficiary. 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. As the beneficiary's ultimate worksite remains unclear, it has not been shown that the work would be covered by the location on the certified LCA. For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

In view of the foregoing, the petitioner has not overcome the director's objections. For these reasons, the petition may not be approved. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

Beyond the decision of the director, the beneficiary does not appear to be qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. The record does not contain an evaluation of the beneficiary's credentials from a service that specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(3). For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO 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 Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis).

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, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.