



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

D4

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: EAC 00 132 50352 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: FEB 13 2001

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiaries: [Redacted]

Petition: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to § 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b)

**PUBLIC COPY**

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: Self-represented

Identification data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

INSTRUCTIONS:

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

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Weimann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner engages in apicultural services. It desires to employ the beneficiary as a queen breeder and production manager for a period of nine months. The Department of Labor issued a temporary labor certification. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary qualified for the position.

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a letter regarding the beneficiary's experience.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii), defines an H-2B temporary worker as:

an alien...having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning, who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform other temporary service or labor if unemployed persons capable of performing such service or labor cannot be found in this country, but this clause shall not apply to graduates of medical schools coming to the United States to perform services as members of the medical profession....

The nontechnical description of the job on the Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750) reads:

Schedule queen breeding activities according to customer demand. Oversee the genetics of our Arsy-c-1 breeding stock. Implement a disease inspection and control program with the assistance of the State bee inspection. Assist with the training of local labor. Assist with routine apiary equipment.

The other special requirements on Form ETA 750 read:

Familiarization with Apis Carnica (Russian) strain of bees is essential. Proficiency in English not necessary. Proficiency in Russian helpful but not essential.

The English translation of a letter from the beneficiary's co-worker dated June 27, 2000 does not state that the beneficiary is familiar with the Apis Carnica strain of bees. Therefore, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary has the qualifications specified by the petitioner on the labor

certification. This petition cannot be approved for another reason.

Matter of Artee Corp., 18 I&N Dec. 366 (Comm. 1982), as codified in current regulations at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(6)(ii), specified that the test for determining whether an alien is coming "temporarily" to the United States to "perform temporary services or labor" is whether the need of the petitioner for the duties to be performed is temporary. It is the nature of the need, not the nature of the duties, that is controlling. See 55 Fed. Reg. 2616 (1990).

As a general rule, the period of the petitioner's need must be a year or less, although there may be extraordinary circumstances where the temporary services or labor might last longer than one year. The petitioner's need for the services or labor must be a one-time occurrence, a seasonal need, a peakload need, or an intermittent need. 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(B).

The petition indicates that the dates of intended employment for the beneficiary are from March 2001 until November 2001. The petition also indicates that the employment is seasonal and the temporary need is unpredictable.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(B)(2) states that for the nature of the petitioner's need to be a seasonal need, the petitioner must establish that the services or labor is traditionally tied to a season of the year by an event or pattern and is of a recurring nature. The petitioner shall specify the period(s) of time during each year in which it does not need the services or labor. The employment is not seasonal if the period during which the services or labor is not needed is unpredictable or subject to change or is considered a vacation period for the petitioner's permanent employees.

The petition indicates that the beneficiary will be responsible for grafting larvae for the queen bee production program. The petition also indicates that the petitioner plans to have the beneficiary train American workers. It appears that the petitioner has a permanent need for the beneficiary. The petitioner has not shown that the nature of its need for a queen breeder and production manager is temporary in nature.

Further, petitions pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii) of the Act for a class or type of employee for which the petitioner has a permanent need where the petitioner makes attempts to establish the temporariness of its need for the beneficiary's services by stipulating that the beneficiary will function as a trainer or instructor rather than in a productive capacity must be accompanied by evidence of the existence of a training program, by evidence that the petitioner has recruited or hired trainees, and by evidence that the petitioner can viably employ a full-time

instructor and can viably simultaneously operate a training program and a commercial or other enterprise. Matter of Golden Dragon Chinese Restaurant, 19 I&N Dec. 238 (Comm. 1984).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. Here, the petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.