



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

PUBLIC COPY

B4



FILE: [REDACTED] OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER
SRC 08 800 09211

Date: APR 12 2010

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

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to
Section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C)

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.

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The decision of the director will be withdrawn and the appeal will be sustained.

The petitioner is a multinational corporation operating in the United States as an international airline. Accordingly, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C), as a multinational executive or manager. In denying the petition, the director found that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary would be employed in the United States in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity.

On appeal, counsel submits an appellate brief disputing the director's findings as well as additional documentation regarding the beneficiary's position within the petitioning organization and the organization's structural make-up.

Section 203(b) of the Act states in pertinent part:

(1) Priority Workers. -- Visas shall first be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are aliens described in any of the following subparagraphs (A) through (C):

* * *

(C) *Certain Multinational Executives and Managers.* -- An alien is described in this subparagraph if the alien, in the 3 years preceding the time of the alien's application for classification and admission into the United States under this subparagraph, has been employed for at least 1 year by a firm or corporation or other legal entity or an affiliate or subsidiary thereof and who seeks to enter the United States in order to continue to render services to the same employer or to a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a capacity that is managerial or executive.

The language of the statute is specific in limiting this provision to only those executives and managers who have previously worked for a firm, corporation or other legal entity, or an affiliate or subsidiary of that entity, and who are coming to the United States to work for the same entity, or its affiliate or subsidiary.

The statutory definition of "managerial capacity" allows for both "personnel managers" and a "function managers." See section 101(a)(44)(A)(i) and (ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(44)(A)(i) and (ii). Personnel managers are required to primarily supervise and control the work of other supervisory, professional, or managerial employees. Contrary to the common understanding of the word "manager," the statute plainly states that 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)(A)(iv) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(ii)(B)(2). If a beneficiary directly supervises other employees, the beneficiary must also have the authority to hire and fire those employees, or recommend those actions, and take other personnel actions. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(ii)(B)(3).

In the denial, the director found that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary's subordinates in the United States are professional employees. However, as indicated in section 101(a)(44)(A)(ii), an individual

that is to be employed in a managerial capacity may oversee the work of supervisory, professional, or managerial subordinates. Thus, the beneficiary's oversight is not merely limited to professional employees and may include supervisory and/or managerial employees as well. According to the evidence provided by the petitioner, the beneficiary does in fact oversee the work of managerial and supervisory employees. This point, along with other relevant factors, is adequately addressed in counsel's appellate brief.

Therefore, while the director was correct in placing great emphasis on the descriptions of the beneficiary's duties with the U.S. entity, this element must be assessed in light of a comprehensive analysis of other relevant factors. These factors include the overall organizational structure, which in the present matter is complex with a number of managerial tiers, as well as the beneficiary's position with respect to others within the department he manages. Consideration of these factors strongly indicates that the petitioning entity is widely staffed with subordinate first-line supervisors and individuals who are assigned to perform the daily non-qualifying tasks. *Cf. Family Inc. v. USCIS*, 469 F.3d 1313 (9th Cir. 2006)

In the present matter, the petitioner provided sufficient documentation to meet the preponderance of the evidence standard thereby establishing that the beneficiary would more likely than not be employed in the United States in a primarily managerial or executive capacity. *See* section 101(a)(44)(A) of the Act.

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. The petitioner in the instant case has sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.