




D7

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

PUBLIC COPY

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



File: SRC-01-084-56433

Office: Texas Service Center

Date:

FEB 28 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

**Identifying 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 that 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 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 that 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. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is described as an exporter of sports apparel. It seeks to extend the beneficiary's period of temporary employment in the United States as its vice president and general manager. The Director, Texas Service Center, determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been or would be employed in a primarily managerial or executive capacity and denied the petition.

On appeal, the petitioner asserts that sufficient evidence has been submitted to warrant approval of the petition.

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.

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.

The United States petitioner was incorporated in 1999 and claims that it is a subsidiary of the overseas company, Camilo Restrepo & Company, located in Bogota, Colombia. The petitioner declares three employees. The petitioner seeks to extend the beneficiary's period of employment for two years at an annual salary of \$36,450.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the petitioner has established that the beneficiary will be employed primarily in a managerial or executive capacity.

Section 101(a)(44)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(44)(A),

provides:

The term "managerial capacity" means an assignment within an organization in which the employee primarily-

- i. manages the organization, or a department, subdivision, function, or component of the organization;
- ii. supervises and controls the work of other supervisory, professional, or managerial employees, or manages an essential function within the organization, or a department or subdivision of the organization;
- iii. if another employee or other employees are directly supervised, has the authority to hire and fire or recommend those as well as other personnel actions (such as promotion and leave authorization), or if no other employee is directly supervised, functions at a senior level within the organizational hierarchy or with respect to the function managed; and
- iv. exercises discretion over the day-to-day operations of the activity or function for which the employee has authority. A first-line supervisor is not considered to be acting in a managerial capacity merely by virtue of the supervisor's supervisory duties unless the employees supervised are professional.

Section 101(a)(44)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(44)(B), provides:

The term "executive capacity" means an assignment within an organization in which the employee primarily-

- i. directs the management of the organization or a major component or function of the organization;
- ii. establishes the goals and policies of the organization, component, or function;
- iii. exercises wide latitude in discretionary decision-making; and
- iv. receives only general supervision or direction from higher level executives, the board of directors, or stockholders of the organization.

In a letter accompanying the initial petition, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary, in his position as vice president and

general manager, would serve "a key role in the expansion plans, and his continuing presence is essential to bring the expansion efforts to a successful conclusion."

Pursuant to a notice dated March 22, 2001, the petitioner was requested to submit "an organizational chart of the U.S. company, specifying the beneficiary's position within the organizational hierarchy as well as the names and titles of the employees he will supervise." In response, the petitioner provided an organizational chart of the Colombian parent company. This chart lists the beneficiary as president of the U.S. petitioner and names just two workers under his supervision: a technical assistant and an administrative assistant.

The director determined that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary was to be employed in a managerial or executive capacity and denied the petition. On appeal, the petitioner admitted that the beneficiary "directly supervised the administration and sales of the [company]."

On review, the record as presently constituted is not persuasive in demonstrating that the beneficiary will be employed in a primarily managerial or executive capacity. The fact that an individual possesses an executive or managerial title and operates a small business does not establish *prima facie* eligibility for classification as a manager or executive within the meaning of section 101(a)(44)(A) and (B) of the Act. The Service must first look to the petitioner's description of the beneficiary's job duties and the evidence submitted in support of the claimed duties.

It appears that a significant portion of the beneficiary's time would be spent directly overseeing the sale of merchandise. An employee who primarily performs the tasks necessary to provide a company's services is not considered to be employed in a managerial or executive capacity. Matter of Church Scientology International, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 604 (Comm. 1988).

The evidence does not demonstrate that the beneficiary's primary duties will be directing the management of the organization; instead, it appears that he will be primarily performing the petitioner's services in trading with its customers and suppliers. The petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary will be primarily supervising a subordinate staff of professional, managerial, or supervisory personnel who relieve him from performing nonqualifying duties. The petitioner has not demonstrated that it has reached or will reach a level of organizational complexity wherein the hiring/firing of personnel, discretionary decision-making, and setting company goals and policies constitute significant components of the duties performed on a day-to-day basis. Nor does the record support a conclusion that the beneficiary primarily manages an essential function within the organization and functions at a senior level in an

organizational hierarchy on a day-to-day basis. Based on the record of proceeding as constituted, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary will be employed primarily in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity. For this reason, the petition may not be approved.

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.