


D7

Department of Homeland Security

Citizenship and immigration Services


identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
425 Eye Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: WAC-02-056-52890 Office: California Service Center Date: SEP 15 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 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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner, a procurer and seller of aquatic products, seeks to extend its authorization to employ the beneficiary temporarily in the United States as its assistant general manager. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary would be employed in a primarily managerial or executive capacity.

On appeal, counsel states that the Bureau did not apply the law correctly.

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.

Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(3) state 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 (l)(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.

Regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(14)(ii) state that a visa petition under section 101(a)(15)(L) which involved the opening of a new office may be extended by filing a new Form I-129, accompanied by the following:

(A) Evidence that the United States and foreign entities are still qualifying organizations as defined in paragraph (l)(1)(ii)(G) of this section;

(B) Evidence that the United States entity has been doing business as defined in paragraph (1) (1) (ii) (H) of this section for the previous year;

(C) A statement of the duties performed by the beneficiary for the previous year and the duties the beneficiary will perform under the extended petition;

(D) A statement describing the staffing of the new operation, including the number of employees and types of positions held accompanied by evidence of wages paid to employees when the beneficiary will be employed in a managerial or executive capacity; and

(E) Evidence of the financial status of the United States operation.

The petitioner states that it was established in 1987 and that it is a subsidiary of [REDACTED] & [REDACTED] located in China. The petitioner declares six employees and a gross annual income of \$311,418. It seeks to extend the petition's validity and the beneficiary's stay for two years at a salary of \$2,000 per month.

The issue to be addressed in this proceeding is whether the beneficiary will be employed in a primarily managerial or executive capacity.

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

"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:

"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.

The petitioner's general manager described the beneficiary's duties as follows:

- (1) Manage all aspects of the organization including all operations and sales.
- (2) Supervise and control the work of other supervisory, professional, or managerial employees.
- (3) Have the authority to hire and fire or recommend those as well as other personnel actions (such as promotion and leave authorization) for those employees directly supervised; and
- (4) Exercise discretion over the day to day operations of the activity or function for which the beneficiary has authority.

In response to the Bureau's request for additional evidence, the petitioner's general manager submitted a list of six employment functions purportedly performed by the beneficiary. As the director, in his decision, listed those duties, the duties will not be restated here.

On appeal, counsel states that the Bureau misapplied the law in denying the petition. Counsel cites an unpublished AAU decision, which has no precedential effect in this proceeding. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c).

The record contains insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the beneficiary will be employed in a primarily managerial or executive capacity. The petitioner has provided no comprehensive description of the beneficiary's duties that would demonstrate that the beneficiary will be managing the organization, or managing a department, subdivision, function, or component of the company. The petitioner has not shown that the beneficiary will be functioning at a senior level within an organizational hierarchy other than in position title.

The record does not demonstrate that the beneficiary will be managing a subordinate staff of professional, managerial, or supervisory personnel who relieve him from performing nonqualifying duties.

Based on the evidence furnished, it cannot be found that the beneficiary has been or will be employed in a primarily 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.