

PUBLIC COPY

Identifying data does
prevent clearly unwa.
invasion of personal pr.



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D 7

DEC 07 2006

FILE: WAC 01 287 56299 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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)

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 Director, California Service Center, denied the petition for a nonimmigrant visa. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant petition seeking to extend the employment of its president as an L-1A nonimmigrant intracompany transferee pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). The petitioner is a corporation organized in the State of California and claims to be an interior design and architectural consulting firm. The petitioner states that it is a subsidiary of Architectural [REDACTED], located in Korea. The beneficiary was initially granted a one-year period of stay to open a new office in the United States. The petitioner now seeks to extend the beneficiary's stay.

The director denied the petition concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary would be employed in the United States in a managerial or executive capacity.

On appeal, the petitioner disputes the director's findings and urges the director to reassess the adverse conclusion.

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.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(14)(ii) 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 (l)(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.

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 support of the petition, the petitioner stated that under the extended position the beneficiary would be responsible for business expansion and development; implementing company goals and policies; and hiring, training, and supervising staff. The petitioner also stated that the beneficiary would have discretionary decision-making authority and would serve as the liaison between the foreign and U.S. companies.

On January 28, 2002, CIS issued a request for additional evidence instructing the petitioner to provide its organizational chart naming all of the employees that are directly under the beneficiary's supervision. The petitioner was also asked to provide brief job descriptions for its employees and to explain the company's

managerial hierarchy and staffing levels. In addition the petitioner was instructed to provide its quarterly wage reports for all employees for the last three quarters.

The petitioner's response included an organizational chart indicating that the petitioner employs a sales manager and the beneficiary as the company president. The chart indicates that it outsources to other companies for all of its architectural consulting, engineering, and graphics design needs. The petitioner also submitted three of its quarterly wage reports for 2001 listing its two employees.

On December 15, 2002, the director denied the petition noting that the petitioner lacks the support staff necessary to relieve the beneficiary from having to perform non-qualifying duties. The director concluded that the record does not contain sufficient evidence to conclude that the beneficiary's duties are primarily of a managerial or executive capacity.

On appeal, the beneficiary submits a letter, dated January 13, 2003, explaining the nature of the petitioning company's business and the stages of each design project from beginning to end. Although the beneficiary provided an adequate illustration of the architecture business, his statements suggest that the petitioning organization has not expanded to a point where a primarily managerial or executive position would be necessary. The beneficiary's significant role in seeking out clientele and generally starting the company's operations is undisputed. However, when examining the executive or managerial capacity of the beneficiary, the AAO will look first to the petitioner's description of the job duties. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(3)(ii). Specifics are clearly an important indication of whether a beneficiary's duties are primarily executive or managerial in nature, otherwise meeting the definitions would simply be a matter of reiterating the regulations. *Fedin Bros. Co., Ltd. v. Sava*, 724 F. Supp. 1103 (E.D.N.Y. 1989), *aff'd*, 905 F.2d 41 (2d. Cir. 1990). Although the beneficiary in the instant case has provided little detail regarding his actual daily tasks, his statements on appeal and the record as a whole suggest that the beneficiary has been and would continue to be involved in soliciting the petitioner's clientele. The beneficiary has clearly stated that his primary goal is "to make my client[s] happy" in order to gain the good reputation that would enable him to build a larger clientele base. While the AAO does not dispute the significance of the beneficiary's role within the petitioner's organization, it is noted that an employee who primarily performs the tasks necessary to produce a product or to provide 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).

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. Although the petitioner has been operating as a provider of various professional services for over one year, it appears to still be in its initial stages of development requiring the beneficiary to solicit clientele and to be directly involved in the overall daily operational tasks. Regardless of the difficulties the petitioner has had in getting its operation beyond the initial stage of development, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(3)(v)(C) allows the intended United States operation one year within the date of approval of the petition to support an executive or managerial position. There is no provision in CIS regulations that allows for an extension of this one-year period. If the business is not sufficiently operational after one year, the petitioner is ineligible by regulation for an extension. In the instant matter, the evidence in the petitioner's record of proceeding supports the director's conclusion that the petitioner lacks a sufficient support staff to allow the beneficiary to focus on primarily qualifying tasks. Therefore, the petitioner has not reached the point that it can employ the beneficiary in a predominantly managerial or executive position.

The fact that an individual manages a small business does not necessarily establish eligibility for classification as an intracompany transferee in a managerial or executive capacity within the meaning of section 101(a)(44) of the Act. The record does not establish that a majority of the beneficiary's duties have been or will be primarily directing the management of the organization. The record indicates that a preponderance of the beneficiary's duties have been and will be directly providing the services of the business. The petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary will be primarily supervising a subordinate staff of professional, managerial, or supervisory personnel, or that he will otherwise be relieved from performing non-qualifying 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. Based on the evidence furnished, it cannot be found that the beneficiary has been or 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.

The fact that an individual manages a small business does not necessarily establish eligibility for classification as an intracompany transferee in a managerial or executive capacity within the meaning of section 101(a)(44) of the Act. The record does not establish that a majority of the beneficiary's duties have been or will be primarily directing the management of the organization. The record indicates that a preponderance of the beneficiary's duties have been and will be directly providing the services of the business. The petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary will be primarily supervising a subordinate staff of professional, managerial, or supervisory personnel, or that he will otherwise be relieved from performing non-qualifying 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. Based on the evidence furnished, it cannot be found that the beneficiary has been or 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.