

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy  
**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

B4.

DATE: **AUG 10 2012**  
177

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

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:

[REDACTED]

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

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 appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a private learning institution that seeks to employ the beneficiary as its associate director of development. 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 support of the Form I-140 the petitioner submitted a statement dated February 2, 2010, which contained relevant information pertaining to the petitioner's eligibility, including an overview of the petitioner's business purpose and the beneficiary's proposed employment. The petitioner also provided supporting evidence in the form of payroll documents, promotional materials, and the petitioner's audited financial statements for 2007 and 2008.

The director reviewed the petitioner's submissions and determined that the petition did not warrant approval. The director therefore issued a request for additional evidence (RFE) dated April 27, 2010 informing the petitioner of various evidentiary deficiencies, including the lack of detailed information pertaining to the beneficiary's proposed employment. In an attempt to obtain the necessary information, the director instructed the petitioner to provide a detailed list delineating the beneficiary's specific job duties and the percentage of time the beneficiary planned to allocate to each activity on the list. The director also asked for the petitioner's organizational chart along with a listing of the beneficiary's subordinate employees, if any, and their respective job titles and job descriptions.

The petitioner provided a response, which included the requested job description, which was accompanied by a percentage breakdown and the petitioner's organizational chart.

After reviewing the record, the director concluded that the petitioner failed to establish that the petitioner would employ the beneficiary in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity. The director observed that *the beneficiary supervises only one employee and that the job duties that would be assigned to the beneficiary in his proposed position would not be those of someone working in a managerial or executive capacity*. The director therefore issued a decision dated November 19, 2010 denying the petition.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief in which he restates the previously provided job description and disputes the director's conclusion.

The AAO finds that counsel's brief is not persuasive and fails to overcome the director's denial. The discussion below will provide an analysis of the relevant documentation and will explain the underlying reasoning for the AAO's decision.

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.

A United States employer may file a petition on Form I-140 for classification of an alien under section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Act as a multinational executive or manager. No labor certification is required for this classification. The prospective employer in the United States must furnish a job offer in the form of a statement which indicates that the alien is to be employed in the United States in a managerial or executive capacity. Such a statement must clearly describe the duties to be performed by the alien.

The primary issue to be addressed in this proceeding is the beneficiary's employment capacity in his proposed position with the petitioning U.S. entity. Specifically, the AAO will examine the record to determine whether the petitioner submitted sufficient evidence to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in the United States in a qualifying 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 examining the executive or managerial capacity of the beneficiary, the AAO will look first to the petitioner's description of the proposed job duties. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(j)(5). The AAO will then consider this information in light of the petitioner's organizational hierarchy, the beneficiary's position therein, and the likelihood that the petitioner will relieve the beneficiary from having to primarily perform the daily operational tasks.

The evidence on record indicates that the beneficiary would allocate his time primarily to the performance of non-qualifying tasks. While the AAO acknowledges that no beneficiary is required to allocate 100% of his time to managerial- or executive-level tasks, the petitioner must establish that the non-qualifying tasks the beneficiary would perform are only incidental to the proposed position. An employee who "primarily" performs the tasks necessary to produce a product or to provide services is not considered to be "primarily" employed in a managerial or executive capacity. *See* sections 101(a)(44)(A) and (B) of the Act (requiring that one "primarily" perform the enumerated managerial or executive duties); *see also Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 604 (Comm. 1988). The record shows that the beneficiary would solicit and cultivate business relationships with prospective donors, develop cultivation strategies, plan and attend donor events and attend local chapter events, generate research reports, make gift solicitations, draft proposals for gift solicitation, record donor interactions, plan visits for the petitioner's senior administrative staff when they visit prospective donors, organize alumni events when targeting alumni, draft articles about key donors, present reports to the New York office's finance department, request reports in order to prepare presentations before donors, send inquiries to the admission and financial aid offices, and network with university deans and department heads. Based on the percentage breakdown that accompanied the list of the beneficiary's proposed job duties, it appears that the beneficiary would spend in excess of 65% of his time carrying out these non-qualifying tasks.

While the director also took note of the beneficiary's lack of a subordinate staff, the AAO finds that the list of the beneficiary's actual tasks is a more telling factor, which reveals the true nature of the beneficiary's U.S. employment and establishes that the beneficiary would not allocate the primary portion of his time to

tasks in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity. *See Fedin Bros. Co., Ltd. v. Sava*, 724 F. Supp. 1103, 1108 (E.D.N.Y. 1989), *aff'd*, 905 F.2d 41 (2d. Cir. 1990).

In light of the above, the AAO concludes that the beneficiary would not be employed in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity. Therefore, the instant petition cannot be approved.

While not previously addressed in the director's decision, the AAO finds one additional ground for ineligibility. Specifically, 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(j)(3)(i)(C) requires the petitioner to establish that it has a qualifying relationship with the beneficiary's foreign employer. To establish a "qualifying relationship" under the Act and the regulations, the petitioner must show that the beneficiary's foreign employer and the proposed U.S. employer are the same employer (i.e. a U.S. entity with a foreign office) or that the two entities are related as a "parent and subsidiary" or as "affiliates." *See generally* § 203(b)(1)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(j)(2) (providing definitions of the terms "affiliate" and "subsidiary").

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(j)(2) states in pertinent part:

*Affiliate* means:

- (A) One of two subsidiaries both of which are owned and controlled by the same parent or individual;
- (B) 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;

\* \* \*

*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.

The regulation and case law confirm that ownership and control are the factors that must be examined in determining whether a qualifying relationship exists between United States and foreign entities for purposes of this visa classification. *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593; *see also Matter of Siemens Medical Systems, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 362 (BIA 1986); *Matter of Hughes*, 18 I&N Dec. 289 (Comm. 1982). In the context of this visa petition, ownership refers to the direct or indirect legal right of possession of the assets of an entity with full power and authority to control; control means the direct or indirect legal right and authority to direct the establishment, management, and operations of an entity. *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. at 595.

The petitioner did not address the topic of ownership in any of the supporting documents. The AAO therefore finds that the petitioner has failed to establish that a qualifying relationship exists between the petitioner and the beneficiary's employer abroad.

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis). Therefore, based on the additional ground of ineligibility discussed above, this petition cannot be approved.

The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. 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 has not sustained that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.