

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security


Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE

425 Eye Street N.W.

BCIS AAO, 20 Mass., 3/F

Washington, D.C. 20536



File: WAC 00 243 56655 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

APR 18 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



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

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



**PUBLIC COPY**

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 that 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 Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Service (Bureau) 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 that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

8

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a manufacturer and retailer of specialty garments, curtains, carpets, napkins, and similar items. It seeks to employ the beneficiary temporarily in the United States as its manager. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that a qualifying relationship exists between the U.S. entity and the beneficiary's foreign employer.

On appeal, counsel disputes the director's findings and submits additional evidence in support of his argument.

To establish L-1 eligibility under section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L), the petitioner must demonstrate that the beneficiary, within three years preceding the beneficiary's application for admission into the United States, has been employed abroad in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity, or in a capacity involving specialized knowledge, for one continuous year by a qualifying organization and seeks to enter the United States temporarily in order to continue to render his or her services to the same employer or a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a capacity that is managerial, executive, or involves specialized knowledge.

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(1)(3) states that an individual petition filed on Form I-129 shall be accompanied by:

(i) Evidence that the petitioner and the organization which employed or will employ the alien are qualifying organizations as defined in paragraph (1)(1)(ii)(G) of this section.

(ii) Evidence that the alien will be employed in an executive, managerial, or specialized knowledge capacity, including a detailed description of the services to be performed.

At issue in this proceeding is whether a qualifying relationship exists between the U.S. petitioner and a foreign entity.

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(1)(1)(ii)(G) provide the following definitions:

*Qualifying organization* means a United States or foreign firm, corporation, or other legal entity which:

(1) Meets exactly one of the qualifying relationships specified in the definitions of a parent, branch, affiliate or subsidiary specified in paragraph

(1) (1) (ii) of this section;

(2) Is or will be doing business (engaging in international trade is not required) as an employer in the United States and in at least one other country directly or through a parent, branch, affiliate, or subsidiary for the duration of the alien's stay in the United States as an intracompany transferee; and

(3) Otherwise meets the requirements of section 101(a) (15) (L) of the Act.

8 C.F.R. § 214.2(1) (1) (ii) (I) states:

*Parent* means a firm, corporation, or other legal entity which has subsidiaries.

8 C.F.R. § 214.2(1) (1) (ii) (J) states:

*Branch* means an operation division or office of the same organization housed in a different location.

8 C.F.R. § 214.2(1) (1) (ii) (K) states:

*Subsidiary* means a firm, corporation, or other legal entity of which a parent owns, directly or indirectly, more than half of the entity and controls the entity; or owns, directly or indirectly, half of the entity and controls the entity; or owns, directly or indirectly, 50 percent of a 50-50 joint venture and has equal control and veto power over the entity; or owns, directly or indirectly, less than half of the entity, but in fact controls the entity.

8 C.F.R. § 214.2(1) (1) (ii) (L) states, in pertinent part:

*Affiliate* means (1) One of two subsidiaries both of which are owned and controlled by the same parent or individual, or

(2) One of two legal entities owned and controlled by the same group of individuals, each individual owning and controlling approximately the same share or proportion of each entity.

The petitioner indicates that the U.S. entity is a branch of the foreign entity. Evidence in support of this claim was not submitted. Therefore, on October 27, 2000 the director issued a notice requesting that the petitioner submit additional evidence. The director noted that the record is void of any evidence of a qualifying relationship and requested that the petitioner submit documentation addressing that deficiency.

In response, the petitioner submitted a letter reasserting its claim that it has been set up to operate as a branch of the overseas entity. The petitioner failed, however, to submit supporting documentation regarding the issue of the existence of a qualifying relationship between the United States and foreign entities.

The director denied the petition, reiterating her prior determination that the petitioner had provided no evidence of a qualifying relationship.

On appeal, counsel disputes the director's findings, asserting that the petitioner has submitted sufficient evidence to warrant approval of the petition. The petitioner submits a letter from the president of the foreign entity, claiming to be the owner of that entity and stating that the U.S. petitioner is a branch of the foreign organization. Counsel also submitted documentation to establish that the foreign entity is doing business. However, the record contains no documentary evidence to demonstrate ownership and control of the foreign organization. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). The petitioner has not demonstrated that a qualifying relationship exists between the U.S. and foreign organizations. For this reason, the petition may not be approved.

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proof 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.