

Mary Kenney (DC #1044695)\*  
c/o American Immigration Council  
1331 G Street NW, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (617) 819-4681  
Email: mary@immigrationlitigation.org

Zachary Nightingale (CA #184501)  
Van Der Hout LLP  
180 Sutter Street, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 981-3000  
Facsimile: (415) 981-3003  
Email: ndca@vblaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs MadKudu Inc., Quick Fitting, Inc., 2nd Street USA, Inc., and Hanguang International Inc.

*(Additional Counsel for Plaintiffs Listed on the Following Page)*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

MADKUDU INC.; QUICK FITTING, INC.;  
2nd STREET USA, INC.; AND HANGUANG  
INTERNATIONAL INC., Individually and On  
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION  
SERVICES; Kenneth T. CUCCINELLI, Senior  
Official Performing Duties of the Director, U.S.  
Citizenship and Immigration Services, in his  
official capacity,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:20-cv-02653-SVK

**AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**

**CLASS ACTION  
Immigration Case**

1 *Plaintiffs' counsel, continued from first page:*

2  
3 Leslie K. Dellon (DC #250316)\*  
4 American Immigration Council  
5 1331 G Street NW, Suite 200  
6 Washington, DC 20005  
7 Telephone: (202) 507-7530  
8 Facsimile: (202) 742-5619  
9 Email: ldellon@immcouncil.org

10 Jesse M. Bless (MA BBO #660713)\*  
11 American Immigration Lawyers Association  
12 1331 G Street NW, Suite 300  
13 Washington, DC 20005  
14 Telephone: (781) 704-3897  
15 Email: jbless@aila.org

16 Jeff Joseph (CO #28695)\*  
17 Joseph & Hall, P.C.  
18 12203 East Second Avenue  
19 Aurora, CO 80011  
20 Telephone: (303) 297-9171  
21 Email: jeff@immigrationissues.com

22 Charles H. Kuck (GA #429940)\*  
23 Kuck Baxter Immigration LLC  
24 365 Northridge Road, Suite 300  
25 Atlanta, GA 30350  
26 Telephone: (404) 816-8611  
27 Email: CKuck@immigration.net

Counsel for Plaintiffs MadKudu Inc., Quick Fitting, Inc., 2nd Street USA, Inc., and Hanguang International Inc.

*\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

## INTRODUCTION

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1. Employing boilerplate language and uniform faulty reasoning, Defendant U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) routinely and unlawfully denies nonimmigrant employment-based petitions filed by U.S. employers under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), 1184(c)(1) and 1184(i), also known as H-1B petitions, to classify market research analyst positions as a “specialty occupation.” Defendant USCIS’ denials violate the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) and implementing regulations, and the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 701, *et seq.* Plaintiffs MadKudu Inc., Quick Fitting, Inc., 2nd Street USA, Inc., and Hanguang International Inc., four U.S. corporations, challenge Defendant USCIS’ denial of H-1B petitions they filed on behalf of noncitizens they sought to hire in the market research analyst occupation, as well as Defendant USCIS’ pattern and practice of arbitrarily and unlawfully denying petitions for market research analysts filed by similarly situated H-1B petitioners.

2. The H-1B nonimmigrant visa classification allows highly educated noncitizens to work for U.S. employers in specialty occupations. A specialty occupation is one which requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge for which a bachelor’s or higher degree in a specific specialty (or its equivalent) is required. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1).

3. By regulation, a U.S. employer petitioner can establish that a position is within a specialty occupation through any one of several tests set forth in the governing regulation. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) (2020). Relevant here is the first test, which authorizes a position to qualify as a specialty occupation if “[a] baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position.” 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020) (hereinafter, the first regulatory test). Where Defendant USCIS

1 determines that a U.S. employer petitioner satisfies this test, it has demonstrated that the  
2 occupation is a “specialty occupation” and it can hire a qualified noncitizen to fill the position.

3 4. In denying H-1B petitions for market research analysts, Defendant USCIS relies  
4 on the Occupational Outlook Handbook (OOH), a publication of the Bureau of Labor Statistics  
5 of the U.S. Department of Labor, as an authoritative source on the educational requirements for  
6 the occupations which it profiles. Defendant USCIS thus relies upon it to determine if a  
7 bachelor’s or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally required for  
8 entry into the occupation, thus satisfying the first regulatory test.

9  
10 5. The OOH’s profile of the market research analyst occupation demonstrates that  
11 this occupation satisfies the first regulatory test; that is, it demonstrates that a bachelor’s degree  
12 in a specific specialty—market research or a related field—is typically, or normally, required for  
13 work as a market research analyst.

14  
15 6. Defendant USCIS has a pattern and practice of misinterpreting the OOH’s profile  
16 of a market research analyst, mistakenly finding that it does not demonstrate that this occupation  
17 satisfies the first regulatory test. In so finding, Defendant USCIS also has a pattern and practice  
18 of misinterpreting the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), and the first regulatory test, 8 C.F.R.  
19 § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020).

20  
21 7. Had Defendant USCIS correctly applied the first regulatory test and found that the  
22 occupation was a specialty occupation in Plaintiffs’ and putative class members’ cases, it would  
23 have approved their petitions. Plaintiffs seek relief under the APA and the Declaratory Judgment  
24 Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, on behalf of themselves and putative class members to remedy  
25 Defendants’ misapplication of the specialty occupation statute and regulations and its  
26 misinterpretation of the OOH.

**JURISDICTION**

1  
2 8. This case arises under the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.*, and the APA, 5 U.S.C.  
3 § 701 *et seq.* This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to  
4 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction). This Court has authority to grant relief under  
5 the APA and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02. The United States has  
6 waived sovereign immunity under 5 U.S.C. § 702.

**VENUE**

7  
8 9. Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(1)(C) because  
9 Defendants are a U.S. agency and an officer of a U.S. agency acting in his official capacity,  
10 Plaintiff MadKudu Inc. resides in this District, and no real property is involved in this action.

**INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

11  
12  
13 10. This action is properly assigned to the San Jose Division of this Court as Plaintiff  
14 MadKudu Inc. resides in Santa Clara County and a substantial part of the events which give rise  
15 to this claim occurred in Santa Clara County.

**FINAL AGENCY ACTION AND EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES**

16  
17  
18 11. Defendant USCIS’ denial of Plaintiffs’ and putative class members’ H-1B  
19 petitions constitutes final agency action under the APA, as does its policy, pattern and/or practice  
20 regarding its adjudications of H-1B petitions for market research analysts. *See* 5 U.S.C. §§  
21 551(13); 701(b)(2); 704. Neither the INA nor implementing regulations require an administrative  
22 appeal of the denials. Accordingly, Plaintiffs have no further administrative remedies to exhaust.

**PARTIES**

23  
24  
25 12. Plaintiff MadKudu Inc. is a marketing analytics software company headquartered  
26 in Mountain View, Santa Clara County, California. MadKudu filed an H-1B petition for a  
27

1 position in the market research analyst occupation on or about April 2, 2019, which Defendant  
2 USCIS denied on February 24, 2020 for, inter alia, failing to demonstrate that the position  
3 satisfied 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020), the first regulatory test for a specialty  
4 occupation.

5 13. Plaintiff Quick Fitting, Inc. is a supplier of plumbing fittings headquartered in  
6 Warwick, Rhode Island. Quick Fitting filed an H-1B petition for a market research analyst on or  
7 about August 20, 2019, which Defendant USCIS denied on January 23, 2020 for, inter alia,  
8 failing to demonstrate that the position satisfied 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020), the first  
9 regulatory test for a specialty occupation.  
10

11 14. Plaintiff 2nd Street USA, Inc. operates and manages six second-hand clothing  
12 retail stores, one in New York and the others in Southern California, with headquarters in Los  
13 Angeles, California. 2nd Street USA filed an H-1B petition for a position in the market research  
14 analyst occupation on or about April 11, 2019, which Defendant USCIS denied on September  
15 12, 2019 for, inter alia, failing to demonstrate that the position satisfied 8 C.F.R.  
16 § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020), the first regulatory test for a specialty occupation.  
17

18 15. Plaintiff Hanguang International Inc. is an educational consulting services  
19 company headquartered in New York, New York. It provides services to Chinese students  
20 already studying in the United States and those who are considering this option. It also provides  
21 services to an affiliated company in China. Hanguang International filed an H-1B petition for a  
22 position in the market research analyst occupation on or about April 2, 2019, which Defendant  
23 USCIS denied on November 1, 2019 for, inter alia, failing to demonstrate that the position  
24 satisfied 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020), the first regulatory test for a specialty  
25 occupation.  
26  
27

1 16. Defendant USCIS is a component of the Department of Homeland Security,  
2 6 U.S.C. § 271, and an agency within the meaning of the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 551(1). USCIS is  
3 responsible for adjudicating immigration benefits, including H-1B petitions. USCIS denied  
4 Plaintiffs' H-1B petitions.

5 17. Defendant Kenneth T. Cuccinelli is, at the time this Complaint is filed, the Senior  
6 Official Performing Duties of the Director, as the position of USCIS Director remains vacant. In  
7 this position, he is responsible for overseeing the adjudication of immigration benefits and  
8 establishing and implementing governing policies. The USCIS Director has ultimate  
9 responsibility for the adjudication of H-1B petitions. Defendant Cuccinelli is sued in his official  
10 capacity.  
11

12 **OVERVIEW OF THE LAW AND ADMINISTRATIVE**  
13 **DECISIONMAKING PROCESS**

14 18. Congress established a nonimmigrant classification to permit noncitizens to  
15 temporarily perform services in the United States in specialty occupations. 8 U.S.C.  
16 § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). This nonimmigrant classification is commonly referred to as H-1B.

17 19. A U.S. employer must follow a multi-step, two-agency process to obtain an H-1B  
18 classification for a position it seeks to fill with a foreign worker. First, it must file a Labor  
19 Condition Application with the U.S. Department of Labor in which it attests to standards to  
20 which it will adhere. On this application, the employer must identify the Standard Occupational  
21 Classification (SOC) code and occupational title of the position it seeks to fill. The SOC system  
22 is a federal statistical standard used by federal agencies to classify workers into occupational  
23 categories for the purpose of collecting, calculating, or disseminating data.

24  
25 20. Upon the Department of Labor's certification of the Labor Condition Application,  
26 the U.S. employer will file it and an H-1B petition with Defendant USCIS. In its H-1B petition,  
27

1 the U.S. employer petitioner must demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the  
2 position it seeks to fill is in a specialty occupation.

3 21. A “specialty occupation” is one that requires the “(A) theoretical and practical  
4 application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and (B) attainment of a bachelor’s or  
5 higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the  
6 occupation in the United States.” 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1).

7  
8 22. The regulatory definition of “specialty occupation” first repeats the statutory  
9 definition and then provides a non-exhaustive list of fields as examples of specialty occupations:

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

17 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (2020).

18 23. A proposed job must satisfy one—but only one—of four independent regulatory  
19 tests to qualify as a specialty occupation. Relevant here is the first regulatory test, which is  
20 satisfied if the petitioning U.S. employer demonstrates that:

21 A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement  
22 for entry into the particular position.

23 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020).<sup>1</sup> Defendant USCIS interprets this test as consistent with

24 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1) only if the bachelor’s or higher degree is in a “specific specialty.”

---

25 <sup>1</sup> The other three tests are:

26 (2) The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar  
27 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



1           24.       When considering whether the petitioning U.S. employer’s job meets the first  
2 regulatory test for a specialty occupation, Defendant USCIS first must identify the occupation  
3 within which the job falls. To do this, Defendant USCIS routinely considers the SOC code and  
4 corresponding occupational title the employer provided in the Labor Condition Application it  
5 submitted to the U.S. Department of Labor.

6           25.       After identifying the occupation within which the position falls, Defendant  
7 USCIS consults the OOH with respect to that position. The OOH, updated every two years,  
8 provides profiles of hundreds of occupations that represent most, though not all, jobs in the  
9 United States. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Information Contained in the OOH*  
10 (Jan. 16, 2020), [https://www.bls.gov/oooh/about/occupational-information-included-in-the-](https://www.bls.gov/oooh/about/occupational-information-included-in-the-oooh.htm)  
11 [ooh.htm](https://www.bls.gov/oooh/about/occupational-information-included-in-the-oooh.htm). Among other data, each occupational profile describes the “typical duties performed by  
12 the occupation” and the “typical education and training needed to enter the occupation.” *Id.*  
13 Defendant USCIS recognizes the OOH as an authoritative source on the duties and educational  
14 requirements of the occupations profiled within it.  
15

16           26.       If the occupation the petitioning employer designated in the Labor Condition  
17 Application is in the OOH, Defendant USCIS will compare the H-1B petitioning employer’s job  
18 duties and education requirements with the OOH entry. Where Defendant USCIS decides that  
19 the petitioning employer has correctly identified the job as being within the specified occupation,  
20 it relies upon the OOH to determine whether to approve the H-1B petition under the first  
21

22  
23  
24           (4) The nature of the specific duties are so specialized and complex that knowledge  
25 required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate  
26 or higher degree.

27           8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) (2020). None is relevant here as each presents an alternative means  
of demonstrating that a position is a specialty occupation. Consequently, an approval under any  
one of them is sufficient even where Defendant USCIS denies a petition under one or more of  
the other regulatory tests. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1)-(4).

1 regulatory test—that is, whether the OOH establishes that a bachelor’s degree or higher in a  
2 specific specialty or its equivalent is the normal minimum prerequisite for entry into the  
3 occupation.

4 27. The OOH entry for market research analyst contains the following description of  
5 the educational requirements for entry into the occupation:

6 *Market research analysts typically need a bachelor’s degree in market research or a*  
7 *related field.* Many have degrees in fields such as statistics, math, or computer science.  
8 Others have backgrounds in business administration, the social sciences or  
communications.

9 *Courses in statistics, research methods, and marketing are essential* for these workers.  
10 *Courses in communications and social sciences, such as economics or consumer behavior,*  
are also important.

11 Some market research analyst jobs require a master’s degree. Several schools offer  
12 graduate programs in marketing research, but many analysts complete degrees in other  
13 fields, such as statistics and marketing, and/or earn a master’s degree in business  
14 administration (MBA). A master’s degree is often required for leadership positions or  
positions that perform more technical research.

15 OOH, *How to Become a Market Research Analyst* (Sept. 4, 2019)

16 <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/market-research-analysts.htm#tab-4> (emphasis  
17 added).

18 28. The OOH establishes that a market research analyst satisfies the first regulatory  
19 test for a specialty occupation. First, by establishing that market research analysts “typically  
20 need” a bachelor’s degree, with some jobs requiring a master’s degree, it demonstrates that a  
21 bachelor’s degree is “normally” the minimum degree requirement for the occupation. 8 C.F.R.  
22 § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020). Second, the OOH also establishes that entry into the occupation  
23 “typically” requires a bachelor’s degree in “market research or a related field,” and identifies the  
24 coursework that is “essential” for this occupation—statistics, research methods and marketing—,  
25 thus demonstrating that a “body of highly specialized knowledge” is necessary to perform the job  
26  
27

1 of a market research analyst. Combined, this information demonstrates that the degree is in a  
2 specific specialty.

3 29. Defendant USCIS has a pattern and practice of erroneously denying H-1B  
4 petitions for market research analysts. In its decisions, which routinely employ the same  
5 reasoning and general language, Defendant USCIS ignores the OOH's statement: "Market  
6 research analysts typically need a bachelor's degree in market research or a related field."  
7 Instead, Defendant USCIS finds that the OOH indicates that several degrees or fields of study  
8 may qualify a person to perform the duties of a market research analyst, and then erroneously  
9 concludes that this indicates that the degree requirement is *not* in a specific specialty. In so  
10 deciding, Defendant USCIS erroneously ignores the regulatory term "normally."

12 30. Defendant USCIS' adjudicators rely on—and on information and belief, are  
13 bound by—training materials, templates, and other guidance from Defendant USCIS when  
14 making H-1B specialty occupation decisions, including decisions regarding petitions for market  
15 research analysts. Upon information and belief, Defendant USCIS generally, and erroneously,  
16 fails to include these documents in the administrative record of the case that is being decided.  
17 *See Thompson v. U.S. Dep't of Labor*, 885 F.2d 551, 555 (9th Cir. 1989) (explaining that the  
18 administrative record "consists of all documents and materials directly or *indirectly* considered  
19 by agency decision-makers and includes evidence contrary to the agency's positions") (emphasis  
20 in original) (quotation omitted). The training and guidance which Defendant USCIS provides its  
21 adjudicators reflects Defendant USCIS' policy with respect to the adjudication of market  
22 research analyst H-1B petitions.  
23

24 31. In its decisions, Defendant USCIS misinterprets the plain meaning of the term  
25 "specific specialty." 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1). That multiple degrees will prepare a person to be a  
26

1 market research analyst does not negate the fact that the typical degrees for this occupation are  
2 all closely related to market research and, thus, constitute a specific specialty. *See, e.g., Raj &*  
3 *Co. v. U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Servs.*, 85 F. Supp. 3d 1241, 1247 (W.D. Wash. 2015)  
4 (rejecting USCIS’ interpretation of the OOH entry for market research analysts and holding that  
5 it “impermissibly narrows the plain language of the statute”). Defendant USCIS also ignores the  
6 statutory language that the equivalent of a bachelor’s or higher degree in a specific specialty can  
7 satisfy the statutory definition of a specialty occupation. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1).  
8

9 32. The denials in Plaintiffs’ cases are representative of a pattern and practice of  
10 similar USCIS decisions. Plaintiffs know of at least 60 H-1B market research analyst petitions  
11 that Defendant USCIS denied in the past three calendar years, employing the same reasoning and  
12 similar language in all. On information and belief, these 60 decisions represent only a fraction of  
13 Defendant USCIS’ decisions denying market research analyst H-1B petitions on this basis during  
14 this period. Moreover, this pattern and practice is continuing. Plaintiffs are aware of 6 decisions  
15 issued in the first three months of 2020, in addition to the denials in Plaintiffs MadKudu Inc’s  
16 and Quick Fitting, Inc.’s cases, in which Defendant USCIS denied H-1B petitions for market  
17 research analyst positions on this same basis. On information and belief, these 6 decisions are  
18 only a fraction of the total number of market research analyst H-1B petitions that have been  
19 denied by Defendant USCIS on this basis to date in 2020.  
20

### 21 **PLAINTIFFS’ FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

22 33. Plaintiff MadKudu Inc. is a marketing analytics software company headquartered  
23 in Mountain View, California. Established in 2014, its clients are business-to-business software  
24 as a service (SaaS) companies who want an alternative to the incomplete, yet time-intensive  
25 manual development of sales leads. MadKudu analyzes a client’s customers and segments sales  
26  
27

1 leads based on relevant demographic data, such as the lead's title, industry and business size. Its  
2 data analysis determines which customers are ready to buy from the client. MadKudu's  
3 predictive models adapt automatically based on data, accounting for changes in its clients'  
4 products and markets for new customers.

5 34. On or about April 2, 2019, MadKudu filed a petition with Defendant USCIS  
6 seeking to employ Rafikah Binte Mohamed Halim in H-1B status in a market research analyst  
7 job with the title of product manager. Ms. Mohamed Halim, a national of Singapore, had worked  
8 for MadKudu in H-1B<sup>2</sup> status since June 2018 as product manager. Ms. Mohamed Halim holds  
9 a bachelor's degree in Business Administration with specializations in marketing and analytics  
10 from the National University of Singapore.

12 35. MadKudu attached to its H-1B petition a Labor Condition Application certified  
13 by the Department of Labor, which identified the position by SOC Code 13-1161, an occupation  
14 entitled Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists.

15 36. Defendant USCIS denied the petition on February 24, 2020 for failing to  
16 demonstrate that the position was a specialty occupation under any of the independent regulatory  
17 tests.

18 37. Following its pattern and practice, Defendant USCIS determined that Plaintiff  
19 MadKudu's petition did not meet the first regulatory test because the OOH did not show that  
20 market research analyst positions normally require a minimum of a bachelor's degree or its  
21 equivalent in a specific specialty at the entry level. Defendant USCIS stated that "a range of  
22  
23  
24

---

25 <sup>2</sup> Congress established the H-1B1 classification for nationals of Chile and Singapore under  
26 Fair Trade Agreements with Chile and Singapore. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(8)(A)(i)-(ii),  
27 (g)(8)(B)(ii)(I)-(II). The job must be in a "specialty occupation" and the definition is identical to  
the definition for the H-1B classification. 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(3).

1 educational credentials may qualify an individual to perform the duties of a Market Research  
2 Analysts [sic].”

3 38. In concluding that Plaintiff MadKudu did not meet the first regulatory test,  
4 Defendant USCIS ignored entirely the OOH’s statements that “[m]arket research analysts  
5 typically need a bachelor’s degree in market research or a related field” and that “[c]ourses in  
6 statistics, research methods, and marketing are essential for these workers.”

7  
8 39. On May 11, 2020, less than one month after the original complaint in this action  
9 was filed, Defendant USCIS approved Plaintiff MadKudu Inc.’s H-1B petition. Defendant  
10 USCIS provided no explanation to Plaintiff MadKudu Inc. as to its rationale for reversing its  
11 decision.

12 40. Established in 2004, Plaintiff Quick Fitting, Inc. is a corporation headquartered in  
13 Warwick, Rhode Island. It is the leading supplier of quick connection technologies that can be  
14 used in plumbing, electrical, heating, air-conditioning, fire suppression and oil and gas  
15 applications. It holds over fifty-five patents and has another sixty that are pending. Currently, it  
16 is launching eight new product lines.

17  
18 41. On or about August 20, 2019, Quick Fitting, Inc. filed a petition with Defendant  
19 USCIS seeking an extension of Xiaomeng Liu’s H-1B status based on her employment as a  
20 market research analyst. It sought to continue to employ Ms. Liu in this position for an additional  
21 period with no change in job duties from the H-1B petition previously approved by Defendant  
22 USCIS. Ms. Liu, who had been working with Quick Fitting, Inc. in H-1B status since December  
23 2012, holds a master’s degree in Business Administration with a marketing concentration from  
24 Johnson and Wales University in Providence, Rhode Island.

1 42. Quick Fitting, Inc. attached to its H-1B petition a Labor Condition Application  
2 certified by the Department of Labor, which identified the position by SOC Code 13-1161, an  
3 occupation entitled Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists.

4 43. Defendant USCIS denied the petition on January 23, 2020 for failing to  
5 demonstrate that the position was a specialty occupation under any of the independent regulatory  
6 tests.

7 44. Following its pattern and practice, Defendant USCIS determined that Plaintiff  
8 Quick Fitting, Inc.'s petition did not meet the first regulatory test because the OOH did not show  
9 that market research analyst positions normally require a minimum of a bachelor's degree or its  
10 equivalent in a specific specialty at the entry level. Defendant USCIS noted that "[a] range of  
11 educational qualifications such as business administration and the social sciences may qualify an  
12 individual to perform the duties of a Market Research Analyst and Marketing Specialist."  
13 Defendant USCIS concluded that the "requirement of a degree with a generalized title, such as  
14 business administration or liberal arts, without further specification, does not establish  
15 eligibility."  
16  
17

18 45. In concluding that Plaintiff Quick Fitting, Inc. did not meet the first regulatory  
19 test, Defendant USCIS ignored entirely the OOH's statements that "[m]arket research analysts  
20 typically need a bachelor's degree in market research or a related field" and that "[c]ourses in  
21 statistics, research methods, and marketing are essential for these workers."

22 46. On May 11, 2020, less than one month after the original complaint in this action  
23 was filed, Defendant USCIS approved Plaintiff Quick Fitting, Inc.'s H-1B petition. Defendant  
24 USCIS provided no explanation to Plaintiff Quick Fitting, Inc. as to its rationale for reversing its  
25 decision.  
26  
27

1 47. Plaintiff 2nd Street USA, Inc. operates and manages six retail clothing stores in  
2 the United States: five in Southern California and one in New York City. Established in 2015, it  
3 is part of the Geo Group, which is known in Japan for rebranding the Japanese culture of reusing,  
4 recycling, and refurbishing. Plaintiff 2nd Street USA's retail stores offer name-brand  
5 merchandise from many in-demand brands, such as Diesel and Theory. The stores also offer a  
6 large variety of special and limited-edition name-brand sneakers. 2nd Street USA is unusual in  
7 the types of items it will accept in-store from customers for resale. Items purchased by the stores  
8 are either resold in-store or to a third party as recyclable material. Customers also can shop  
9 online through 2nd Street USA's website.  
10

11 48. On or about April 11, 2019, 2nd Street USA filed an H-1B petition with USCIS  
12 seeking to employ Kankan Yang in H-1B status as a market research analyst. 2nd Street USA  
13 requested a change of status for Ms. Yang, who worked for the company as a market research  
14 analyst, and continues to do so, through Optional Practical Training (OPT). OPT is authorized by  
15 USCIS to permit international students to gain work experience related to their field of study.  
16 Ms. Yang holds a Master of Business Administration from Brandeis University in Waltham,  
17 Massachusetts, where she completed the MBA International Business program with  
18 specializations in Data Analytics and in Marketing.  
19

20 49. 2nd Street USA attached to its H-1B petition a Labor Condition Application  
21 certified by the Department of Labor, which identified the position by SOC Code 13-1161, an  
22 occupation entitled Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists  
23

24 50. Defendant USCIS denied the petition on September 12, 2019 for failing to  
25 demonstrate that the position was a specialty occupation under any of the independent regulatory  
26 tests.  
27



1           51.       Following its pattern and practice, Defendant USCIS determined that Plaintiff 2nd  
2 Street USA’s petition did not meet the first regulatory test because the OOH did not show that  
3 market research analyst positions normally require a minimum of a bachelor’s degree or its  
4 equivalent in a specific specialty at the entry level. 2nd Street USA included the OOH entry for  
5 market research analysts as evidence that market research analyst is a specialty occupation. In its  
6 denial, USCIS stated: “The petitioner has clearly defined that the proffered position falls under  
7 the Market Research Analyst as described in the OOH. As stated above, you have not shown that  
8 the proffered position requires a bachelor’s or higher degree in a specific specialty or its  
9 equivalent.” USCIS also concluded that a “general-purpose degree, such as a degree in business  
10 administration ... without more” is not acceptable for a specialty occupation. Despite stating that  
11 2nd Street USA “has clearly defined” its job as falling under market research analyst as  
12 described in the OOH, USCIS also claimed that the company’s job duties were too generalized to  
13 determine if the job was in a specialty occupation.  
14

15           52.       In concluding that Plaintiff 2nd Street USA, Inc. did not meet the first regulatory  
16 test, Defendant USCIS ignored entirely the OOH’s statements that “[m]arket research analysts  
17 typically need a bachelor’s degree in market research or a related field” and that “[c]ourses in  
18 statistics, research methods, and marketing are essential for these workers.”  
19

20           53.       Plaintiff Hanguang International Inc., established in 2016, provides educational  
21 consulting services to Chinese students who either are studying in the United States or who want  
22 to study in this country. Hanguang International has partnered with ten top Chinese universities  
23 where students can take for-credit courses in English taught by top professors from the United  
24 States and other countries. Plaintiff Hanguang International is the consulting, business  
25 development and education-provider arm of its affiliate, Hanshengguanghua Culture &  
26  
27

1 Education Co., Ltd., a leading education consulting service organization established in China in  
2 2011. Hanguang's services to its affiliate include researching and leading the development of  
3 cooperative agreements between U.S. and Chinese higher education institutions, developing  
4 guidance to Chinese students and Chinese universities, and providing educational opportunities  
5 to Chinese students on vacation breaks in China from their university programs in the United  
6 States.

7  
8 54. On or about April 2, 2019, Plaintiff Hanguang International Inc. filed a petition  
9 with Defendant USCIS seeking to employ Xianglun Meng in H-1B status as a market research  
10 analyst. Mr. Meng has a bachelor's degree in Business Administration from the University of  
11 Cincinnati, in Ohio and a Master of Business Administration from the University of LaVerne, in  
12 California.

13 55. Plaintiff Hanguang International Inc. attached to its H-1B petition a Labor  
14 Condition Application certified by the Department of Labor, which identified the position by  
15 SOC Code 13-1161, an occupation entitled Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists.  
16

17 56. Defendant USCIS denied the petition on November 1, 2019 for failing to  
18 demonstrate that the position was a specialty occupation under any of the independent regulatory  
19 tests.

20 57. Following its pattern and practice, Defendant USCIS determined that Plaintiff  
21 Hanguang International Inc.'s petition did not meet the first regulatory test because the OOH did  
22 not show that market research analyst positions normally require a minimum of a bachelor's  
23 degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty at the entry level. Defendant USCIS noted that "a  
24 range of educational credentials may qualify an individual to perform the duties of a Market  
25 Research Analyst."  
26

1 58. In concluding that Plaintiff Hanguang International Inc. did not meet the first  
2 regulatory test, Defendant USCIS ignored entirely the OOH's statements that "[m]arket research  
3 analysts typically need a bachelor's degree in market research or a related field" and that  
4 "[c]ourses in statistics, research methods, and marketing are essential for these workers."

#### 5 CLASS ALLEGATIONS

6 59. Named Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others who are  
7 similarly situated pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and 23(b)(2). A class action  
8 is proper because this action involves questions of law and fact common to the class, the class is  
9 so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical, Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the  
10 claims of the class, Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class, and  
11 Defendants have acted on grounds that apply generally to the class, so that final injunctive relief  
12 or corresponding declaratory relief is appropriate with respect to the class as a whole.

13  
14 60. Although the H-1B petitions of Plaintiffs MadKudu Inc. and Quick Fitting, Inc.  
15 have been approved, their claim that they are entitled to represent the class remains unresolved  
16 and they retain an interest in representing the class. Additionally, due to Defendants' attempt to  
17 moot the entire case, the claims of these Plaintiffs relate back to the filing of the original  
18 complaint for purposes of class certification. *See, e.g., Pitts v. Terrible Herbst, Inc.*, 653 F.3d  
19 1081, 1091-92 (9th Cir. 2011). Consequently, they remain adequate class representatives.  
20 Moreover, Defendants have provided no assurance that these Plaintiffs will receive approval  
21 from USCIS for petitions they file for H-1B classification for market research analyst in the  
22 future or for extensions for the market research analysts for whom they just received petition  
23 approval.  
24

25  
26 61. The named Plaintiffs seek to represent the following class:  
27

1 All U.S. employers who in 2019 filed, or in the future will file, a petition (Form  
2 I-129 or any successor) with USCIS for an H-1B classification under 8 U.S.C.  
3 § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) for a market research analyst where:

- 4 • USCIS denied or will deny the petition solely or in part based on a  
5 finding that the OOH entry for market research analyst does not establish  
6 that the occupation is a specialty occupation, and thus does not satisfy  
7 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1); and
- 8 • But for this finding, the petition would be approved.

9 62. The proposed class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.  
10 Plaintiffs are not aware of the precise number of potential class members but reasonably estimate  
11 that the number of class members totals at least 40; Defendants, however, are in a position to  
12 identify this number. Upon information and belief, there are many more than two dozen current  
13 members of the class and an unknown number—likely in the hundreds—of future members.

14 63. Defendant USCIS denied an average of 20 H-1B petitions for market research  
15 analysts in each of the last three full calendar years (between 17 and 22 each year) and is on  
16 track to deny at least that many in 2020—having denied at least 6 such petitions, in addition to  
17 Plaintiffs MadKudu Inc. and Quick Fitting, Inc.’s petitions, in the first three months of the year.  
18 All such denials found that the OOH did not establish that a market research analyst was a  
19 specialty occupation under the first regulatory test. All such denials contained the same or  
20 similar language as that found in Plaintiffs’ denials, along with the same reasoning.

21 64. On information and belief, these decisions represent only a fraction of the H-1B  
22 petitions for market research analysts denied on this basis each year. Other than the decisions in  
23 Plaintiffs’ cases, these decisions were issued by Defendant USCIS’ Administrative Appeals  
24 Office (USCIS AAO) and posted on electronic legal research sites. They are the only USCIS  
25 decisions that are publicly available. Only a small fraction of H-1B petitioners whose petitions  
26 are denied appeal the denial to USCIS’ AAO. Consequently, it is reasonable to infer that these  
27 decisions represent only a fraction of the H-1B petitions for market research analysts that were

1 denied during the years in question. These numbers, thus, support a reasonable estimate that  
2 there are at least several dozen current putative class members, and likely many more. This  
3 reasonable estimate of current class members coupled with the existence of unknown future class  
4 members makes joinder impracticable.

5 65. Questions of law and fact common to the proposed class predominate over any  
6 questions affecting only the individually named Plaintiffs. These include, but are not limited to,  
7 whether Defendant USCIS misinterprets the OOH entry for market research analyst; whether  
8 Defendant USCIS misinterprets 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1) and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1)  
9 (2020); whether Defendant USCIS has a pattern and practice of denying the H-1B petitions of  
10 Plaintiffs and putative class members on the basis alleged in this suit; and whether its denial of  
11 Plaintiffs' and putative class members' H-1B petitions violates the APA in that it is arbitrary and  
12 capricious, and contrary to the INA and its implementing regulations. Resolution of these  
13 common questions will resolve the entire case.  
14

15 66. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the proposed class insofar as they  
16 have been subject to Defendant USCIS' pattern and practice of denying H-1B petitions for  
17 market analyst positions under the first regulatory test based upon a misinterpretation of the  
18 statute, regulations and the OOH.  
19

20 67. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the proposed class  
21 members because they seek relief on behalf of the class as a whole and have no interest  
22 antagonistic to other class members.  
23

24 68. Plaintiffs are represented by competent counsel with extensive experience in  
25 complex class actions and extensive knowledge of immigration law.  
26  
27

1 69. In denying the H-1B petitions of Plaintiffs and putative class members,  
2 Defendants have acted and will continue to act on grounds generally applicable to the entire  
3 class, thereby making final injunctive and declaratory relief appropriate to the class as a whole.  
4 The class may therefore be properly certified under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2).

5 **DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF ALLEGATIONS**

6 70. An actual and substantial controversy exists between the Plaintiffs and proposed  
7 class members and the Defendants as to their respective rights and obligations. Plaintiffs contend  
8 that Defendants' actions violate Plaintiffs' rights and the rights of the proposed class members.  
9

10 71. Defendants' pattern and practice of misinterpreting the OOH and misapplying the  
11 law forecloses Plaintiffs and the class they seek to represent from demonstrating, absent  
12 litigation, that their jobs are in a specialty occupation based on the first regulatory test. Where the  
13 OOH demonstrates that a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty is normally the  
14 minimum requirement for entry in the occupation that includes the job the H-1B petition seeks to  
15 fill, no further evidence is needed. This is the case with respect to the OOH entry for market  
16 research analyst.  
17

18 72. Plaintiffs and proposed class members have suffered a legal wrong and have been  
19 adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action for which there is no adequate remedy at law.  
20 Defendants' policy and practice of denying H-1B petitions for market research analysts under the  
21 first regulatory test constitutes final agency action. There are no administrative remedies that  
22 Plaintiffs must exhaust.  
23

24 73. Based on the foregoing, the Court should grant declaratory and injunctive relief  
25 under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202 and 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706.  
26  
27

**CAUSES OF ACTION  
COUNT ONE  
(Violation of the APA)**

1  
2  
3 74. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference, as if fully set forth herein, the  
4 allegations in paragraphs 1-73 above.

5  
6 75. Plaintiffs and proposed class members seek to hire noncitizens to work in the  
7 specialty occupation of market research analyst. Plaintiffs and proposed class members have a  
8 right to have their H-1B petitions adjudicated by Defendants in accordance with 8 U.S.C.  
9 § 1184(i)(1) and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020).

10 76. Defendants have a pattern and practice of denying these petitions in violation of  
11 these statutory and regulatory provisions. Defendants' pattern and practice of denying these  
12 petitions reflects a policy, whether written or unwritten, that is contrary to law.

13  
14 77. Although recognizing the OOH as authoritative for purposes of determining  
15 whether an occupation profiled within it satisfies the first regulatory test for a specialty  
16 occupation, Defendant USCIS routinely misreads the OOH's profile for market research analyst.  
17 Simultaneously, Defendant USCIS misinterprets the meaning of the statutory term "specific  
18 specialty," 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), ignores entirely the regulatory term "normally," 8 C.F.R.  
19 § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020), and misapplies the statute and the regulation. But for  
20 Defendant's violation of the law, Defendant USCIS would find that Plaintiffs and putative class  
21 members satisfy the first regulatory test for demonstrating that their jobs are in a specialty  
22 occupation.

23  
24 78. Defendants' pattern and practice of misinterpreting the OOH and misinterpreting  
25 and misapplying 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1) and C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020) renders its  
26

1 denials of Plaintiffs' and putative class members' H-1B petitions arbitrary and capricious, an  
2 abuse of discretion, and otherwise not in accordance with law. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

## 3 4 **COUNT TWO**

### 5 **(Violation of the INA and its Implementing Regulations)**

6 79. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference, as if fully set forth herein, the  
7 allegations in paragraphs 1-73 above.

8 80. Plaintiffs and proposed class members seek to hire noncitizens to work in the  
9 specialty occupation of market research analyst. Plaintiffs and proposed class members have a  
10 right to have their H-1B petitions adjudicated by Defendants in accordance with 8 U.S.C.  
11 § 1184(i)(1) and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020). Defendants have a pattern and practice  
12 of denying these petitions in violation of these statutory and regulatory provisions.

13 81. Although recognizing the OOH as authoritative for purposes of determining  
14 whether an occupation profiled within it satisfies the first regulatory test for a specialty  
15 occupation, Defendant USCIS routinely misreads the OOH's profile for market research analyst.  
16 Simultaneously, Defendant USCIS misinterprets the meaning of the statutory term "specific  
17 specialty," 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), ignores the regulatory term "normally," 8 C.F.R.  
18 § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020), and misapplies the statute and the regulation. But for  
19 Defendant's violation of the law, Defendant USCIS would find that Plaintiffs and putative class  
20 members satisfy the first regulatory test for demonstrating that their jobs are in a specialty  
21 occupation.  
22  
23

24 82. Defendants' pattern and practice of misinterpreting the OOH and misinterpreting  
25 and misapplying 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1) and C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (2020) renders their  
26 denial of Plaintiffs' and putative class members' H-1B petitions contrary to law. An actual  
27



1 controversy exists between the parties over which this Court may issue a declaratory judgment,  
2 specifying the legal rights of the Plaintiffs and putative class members and the legal obligations  
3 of the Defendants, pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

4 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that this Court grant the following relief:

- 6 (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 7 (2) Certify the case as a class action, as proposed herein;
- 8 (3) Appoint Plaintiffs as representatives of the class and Plaintiffs' counsel as class  
9 counsel;
- 10 (4) Set aside and vacate the denials of Plaintiffs 2nd Street USA, Inc.'s and  
11 Hanguang International, Inc.'s and proposed class members' H-1B petitions;
- 12 (5) Declare that Defendants have unlawfully engaged in a pattern and practice of  
13 misinterpreting the OOH and misinterpreting and misapplying 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1) and  
14 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1);
- 15 (6) Enjoin Defendants from violating the plain meaning of "typically" as used in the  
16 OOH as anything other than "normally" when determining whether a U.S. employer has met the  
17 first regulatory test for demonstrating that its job is in a specialty occupation;
- 18 (7) Award Plaintiffs' counsel reasonable attorneys' fees under the Equal Access to  
19 Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d), 5 U.S.C. § 504, or any other applicable law; and  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 (8) Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just, equitable and  
2 appropriate.

3 Respectfully submitted this 20<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2020,

4 /s/ Mary Kenney  
5 Mary Kenney (DC #1044695)\*  
6 c/o American Immigration Council  
7 1331 G Street NW, Suite 200  
8 Washington, DC 20005  
9 Phone: (617) 819-4681  
10 Email:  
11 mary@immigrationlitigation.org

12 Zachary Nightingale (CA #184501)  
13 Van Der Hout LLP  
14 180 Sutter Street, Suite 500  
15 San Francisco, CA 94104  
16 Phone: (415) 981-3000  
17 Facsimile: (415) 981-3003  
18 Email: ndca@vblaw.com

19 Leslie K. Dellon (DC #250316)\*  
20 American Immigration Council  
21 1331 G Street NW, Suite 200  
22 Washington, DC 20005  
23 Phone: (202) 507-7530  
24 Facsimile: (202) 742-5619  
25 Email: ldellon@immcouncil.org

Jesse M. Bless (MA BBO # 660713)\*  
American Immigration Lawyers  
Association  
1331 G Street NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: (781) 704-3897  
Email: jbless@aila.org

Jeff Joseph (CO #28695)\*  
Joseph & Hall, P.C.  
12203 East Second Avenue  
Aurora, CO 80011  
Phone: (303) 297-9171  
Email: jeff@immigrationissues.com

Charles H. Kuck (GA #429940)\*  
Kuck Baxter Immigration LLC  
365 Northridge Road, Suite 300  
Atlanta, GA 30350  
Phone: (404) 816-8611  
Email: CKuck@immigration.net

26 Counsel for Plaintiffs

27 \* *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*