

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



D4

FILE: WAC 04 057 51155 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 09 2005

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director 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 company that manufactures wood floor in-lays that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a marketing specialist trainee. The director determined that the petitioner did not establish that the training was unavailable in the beneficiary's home country. The director also found that the training program has no fixed schedule, objectives or means of evaluation. The director stated that the beneficiary would be engaged in productive employment beyond that which is incidental and necessary to the training. Finally, the director determined that the petitioner does not have sufficient personnel to conduct the training.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(iii), provides classification for an alien having a residence in a foreign country, which he or she has no intention of abandoning, who is coming temporarily to the United States as a trainee, other than to receive graduate medical education or training, in a training program that is not designed primarily to provide productive employment.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7) states, in pertinent part:

(ii) Evidence required for petition involving alien trainee--(A) Conditions. The petitioner is required to demonstrate that:

- (1) The proposed training is not available in the alien's own country;
- (2) The beneficiary will not be placed in a position which is in the normal operation of the business and in which citizens and resident workers are regularly employed;
- (3) The beneficiary will not engage in productive employment unless such employment is incidental and necessary to the training; and
- (4) The training will benefit the beneficiary in pursuing a career outside the United States.

(B) Description of training program. Each petition for a trainee must include a statement which:

- (1) Describes the type of training and supervision to be given, and the structure of the training program;
- (2) Sets forth the proportion of time that will be devoted to productive employment;
- (3) Shows the number of hours that will be spent, respectively, in classroom instruction and in on-the-job training;

- (4) Describes the career abroad for which the training will prepare the alien;
 - (5) Indicates the reasons why such training cannot be obtained in the alien's country and why it is necessary for the alien to be trained in the United States; and
 - (6) Indicates the source of any remuneration received by the trainee and any benefit, which will accrue to the petitioner for providing the training.
- (iii) Restrictions on training program for alien trainee. A training program may not be approved which:
- (A) Deals in generalities with no fixed schedule, objectives, or means of evaluation;
 - (B) Is incompatible with the nature of the petitioner's business or enterprise;
 - (C) Is on behalf of a beneficiary who already possesses substantial training and expertise in the proposed field of training;
 - (D) Is in a field in which it is unlikely that the knowledge or skill will be used outside the United States;
 - (E) Will result in productive employment beyond that which is incidental and necessary to the training;
 - (F) Is designed to recruit and train aliens for the ultimate staffing of domestic operations in the United States;
 - (G) Does not establish that the petitioner has the physical plant and sufficiently trained manpower to provide the training specified; or
 - (H) Is designed to extend the total allowable period of practical training previously authorized a nonimmigrant student.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129; (2) the director's request for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The director found that the petitioner had not established that the proposed training was unavailable in the beneficiary's home country. On appeal, counsel states that the petitioner previously submitted ten statements from knowledgeable sources attesting that the proposed training was not available in the beneficiary's home country, in addition to a variety of articles regarding the state of the industry in Poland.

The petitioner has not established that training is unavailable in the alien's country. The petitioner is relying on the ten above-referenced statements and a copy of a report from the Internet to establish that the beneficiary could not receive similar training in her home country. The report from the Internet is undated, with no background information provided about the author, so it is difficult to determine its relevancy or authenticity. Several of the letters discuss the absence of training available for the equipment used in the manufacturing fields, but do not discuss marketing training.

Many of the letters indicate that much of the industry in Poland still relies on Communist-era machinery and that there are no well-trained marketing/sales personnel, and that there is little, if any, training available in these fields. Other than stated familiarity with the marketplace in Poland, none of the letters' authors attaches or cites any materials in support of his or her conclusions. 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, the attention of CIS is drawn to the remarkable similarity of the letters submitted to establish that training is unavailable in the beneficiary's home country. All of the letters have similar, and sometimes identical, language. As the letters appear to have been drafted by the same individual or drafted off of a common template, the evidentiary weight of the letters is lessened. CIS may, in its discretion, accept letters and advisory opinion statements as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, CIS is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm., 1988).

Since the AAO has determined that the evidence submitted to establish that the proposed training is unavailable in the beneficiary's home country is unpersuasive, the petitioner has not established that requirement of the regulation.

The director also found that the training program deals in generalities, with no specific schedule, objectives, or means of evaluation. The AAO agrees that the classroom schedule provided in response to the director's request for evidence is general, broken into three, six, nine, 12 or 20-week periods, with a brief paragraph describing the topics to be covered during each block of time. There is no indication of how the time is to be divided between the classroom and hands-on training, despite the director's request for this information. This schedule gives no information regarding what the beneficiary would actually be doing for these periods or how she would be training. It does not provide any specifics to establish that the program does not deal in generalities, which is prohibited by the regulations. While the objectives of the proposed training are clear, the schedule lacks specificity, and the training program has no clear means of evaluation that is related to the training.

There is no indication in the record that the beneficiary would be engaged in productive employment. The AAO does not concur with the director's determination on this issue. The director also determined that the petitioner does not have adequate staff to provide the proposed training. There is no evidence in the record regarding the petitioner's staffing levels, or who would be providing each of the training segments. The AAO agrees that the record does not establish that the petitioner has sufficiently trained staff to provide the training specified, as required by the regulations.

WAC 04 057 51155

Page 5

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

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