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

[redacted]

DATE: DEC 27 2012 OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER FILE: [redacted]

IN RE: [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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its 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 motion 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 any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The director of the Texas Service Center revoked the previously approved preference visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed and the petition will be revoked.

The petitioner is a Florida company engaged in coffee trading and sales, and it seeks to employ the beneficiary as its President/Director of Marketing and Sales. 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.

On August 4, 2011, the director revoked the petition concluding that the petitioner did not submit sufficient evidence in rebuttal to the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services' ("USCIS") Notice of Intent to Revoke ("NOIR") and had not overcome the grounds for revocation. Specifically, the director determined that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary's proposed employment with the U.S. entity would be within a qualifying managerial or executive capacity. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its 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 issue that will be addressed in this proceeding calls for an analysis of the beneficiary's job duties. Specifically, the AAO will examine the record to determine whether the petitioner submitted sufficient evidence to establish that the beneficiary would be employed 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, USCIS will look first to the petitioner's description of the job duties. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(j)(5). Published case law clearly supports the pivotal role of a clearly defined job description, as the actual duties themselves reveal the true nature of the employment. *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); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(j)(5). USCIS reviews the totality of the record, which includes not only the beneficiary's job description, but also takes into account the nature of the petitioner's business, the employment and remuneration of employees, as well as the job descriptions of the beneficiary's subordinates, if any, and any other facts contributing to a complete understanding of a beneficiary's actual role within a given entity.

The definitions of executive and managerial capacity have two parts. First, the petitioner must show that the beneficiary performs the high-level responsibilities that are specified in the definitions. Second, the petitioner must prove that the beneficiary *primarily* performs these specified responsibilities and does not spend a majority of his or her time on day-to-day functions. *Champion World, Inc. v. INS*, 940 F.2d 1533 (Table), 1991 WL 144470 (9th Cir. July 30, 1991).

An analysis of the record does not lead to an affirmative conclusion that the beneficiary was employed abroad or would be employed in the United States in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity.

With regard to the proffered position offered to the beneficiary, the petitioner provided a vague and general job description such as the beneficiary "oversees design, marketing, promotion, delivery and quality of programs, products and services," "oversees fundraising planning and implementation," "managing [the petitioner], on a day to day basis," "setting up a strategy for the future of [the petitioner]," and "offers consulting services to its current customers." It is unclear which specific tasks actually fall within these broad categories and whether the supervisory tasks the beneficiary will perform are of a qualifying nature. The petitioner failed to establish what specific tasks the beneficiary would perform in supervising business affairs or what policy decisions the beneficiary would make. The record is similarly lacking in specific information about the job duties involved in securing the growth of the petitioning entity. Furthermore, the petitioner states that the beneficiary will arrange supply of coffee and coffee related services to its customers but the petitioner did not provide any evidence that it has a contract with the customers. In response to the notice of intent to revoke, the petitioner provided a list of customers but failed to provide any evidence of these relationships such as contracts. Reciting the beneficiary's vague job responsibilities or broadly-cast business objectives is not sufficient; the regulations require a detailed description of the beneficiary's daily job duties. The petitioner has failed to provide any detail or explanation of the beneficiary's activities in the course of his daily routine. The actual duties themselves will reveal the true nature of the employment. *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). The petitioner's vague and general description of the beneficiary's position does not identify the actual duties performed, such that they could be classified as managerial or executive in nature.

In addition, the job description includes several non-qualifying duties such as the beneficiary will be responsible for "entering and executing contracts with new and existing customers," "increasing sales to existing customers," "increasing existing customer base," "conducting negotiations with

sellers," "supervises documentation for a proper execution of the contract (shipping documents, export and import documents) before forwarding them to custom agent," "arranges shipping with shipping lines and forwarding agents," and "price fixing of hedged positions." Developing marketing strategy, running the sales programs and negotiating deals are all operational duties that cannot be classified as managerial or executive tasks. It appears that the beneficiary will be the only person in charge of all of the business operations such as negotiating contracts, marketing, sales, preparing the budget, developing procedures, and handling the shipping and delivery process, rather than managing other individuals to perform the non-qualifying tasks.

Neither the job descriptions counsel has provided nor the organizational structure of the petitioner establish that the beneficiary would be employed in the United States in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity. As indicated by the petitioner, it employs the beneficiary only. The petitioner does not provide evidence that the petitioner employed individuals to assist with the finances, budgeting, bookkeeping, market research, marketing, sales and negotiation of contracts, thus, it appears that the beneficiary is performing the duties inherent in operating a business such as finances, customer service, negotiations, contracts, and shipping services. An employee who "primarily" performs the tasks necessary to produce a product or provide a service 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).

Although counsel states on appeal that the "business model for [the petitioner] relies on outsourcing for the 'vast majority of operations related to traffic management, logistics, legal and fiscal matters of the corporation,'" the petitioner has neither presented evidence to document the existence of these employees nor identified the services these individuals provide. Additionally, the petitioner has not explained how the services of the contracted employees obviate the need for the beneficiary to primarily conduct the petitioner's business. Without documentary evidence to support its statements, the petitioner does not meet its burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm'r 1998).

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 his 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 petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary would be employed in a qualifying capacity.

As required by section 101(a)(44)(C) of the Act, if staffing levels are used as a factor in determining whether an individual is acting in a managerial or executive capacity, USCIS must take into account the reasonable needs of the organization, in light of the overall purpose and stage of development of the organization. To establish that the reasonable needs of the organization justify the beneficiary's

job duties, the petitioner must specifically articulate why those needs are reasonable in light of its overall purpose and stage of development. The petitioner has not explained how the reasonable needs of the petitioning enterprise justify the beneficiary's performance of non-managerial or non-executive duties. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm'r 1998).

Furthermore, the reasonable needs of the petitioner will not supersede the requirement that the beneficiary be "primarily" employed in a managerial or executive capacity as required by the statute. *See* sections 101(a)(44)(A) and (B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(44). The reasonable needs of the petitioner may justify a beneficiary who allocates 51 percent of his duties to managerial or executive tasks as opposed to 90 percent, but those needs will not excuse a beneficiary who spends the majority of his time on non-qualifying duties.

Although counsel suggests that the beneficiary's position may be deemed as that of a function manager which does not focus on the beneficiary's duties as a personnel manager, counsel cannot merely raise these alternate claims to avoid addressing the non-qualifying tasks the beneficiary would have to perform. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The AAO acknowledges counsel's contention that the beneficiary's position is an essential function within the petitioner's organization. The term "function manager" applies generally when a beneficiary does not supervise or control the work of a subordinate staff but instead is primarily responsible for managing an "essential function" within the organization. *See* section 101(a)(44)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(44)(A)(ii). The term "essential function" is not defined by statute or regulation. If a petitioner claims that the beneficiary is managing an essential function, the petitioner must furnish a written job offer that clearly describes the duties to be performed in managing the essential function, i.e. identify the function with specificity, articulate the essential nature of the function, and establish the proportion of the beneficiary's daily duties attributed to managing the essential function. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(3)(ii). In addition, the petitioner's description of the beneficiary's daily duties must demonstrate that the beneficiary manages the function rather than performs the duties related to the function. 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. *Boyang, Ltd. v. I.N.S.*, 67 F.3d 305 (Table), 1995 WL 576839 (9th Cir, 1995)(citing *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. at 604. The petitioner has not provided evidence that the beneficiary manages an essential function. As noted above, the petitioner provided a brief and vague job description that did not discuss how the beneficiary is managing an essential function. Only on appeal did counsel for the petitioner claim that the beneficiary is a function manager. However, as noted above, the beneficiary's job description does not establish that the beneficiary is primarily performing in a managerial capacity.

Beyond the required description of the job duties, USCIS reviews the totality of the record when examining the claimed managerial or executive capacity of a beneficiary, including the petitioner's organizational structure, the duties of the beneficiary's subordinate employees, the presence of other employees to relieve the beneficiary from performing operational duties, the nature of the petitioner's business, and any other factors that will contribute to a complete understanding of a beneficiary's actual duties and role in a business. In the case of a function manager, where no subordinates are directly supervised, these other factors may include the beneficiary's position within the organizational hierarchy, the depth of the petitioner's operations, the indirect supervision of employees within the scope of the function managed, and the value of the budgets, products, or services that the beneficiary manages.

As discussed above, the petitioner has not identified employees within the petitioner's organization, subordinate to the beneficiary, who would relieve the beneficiary from performing routine duties inherent to operating the business since the subordinates' duties are to execute the project and not look for new engagements and lead the projects. The fact that the beneficiary has been given a managerial job title and general oversight authority over the business is insufficient to elevate his position to that of a "function manager" as contemplated by the governing statute and regulations. As discussed above, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary's duties are primarily managerial in nature, and thus he cannot be considered a "function manager."

Other than stating that the proposed position will be responsible for managing an unidentified essential function, counsel provides no explanation or evidence in support of his claim that the beneficiary would qualify as a function manager pursuant to section 101(a)(44)(A)(ii) of the Act. The unsupported statements of counsel on appeal or in a motion are not evidence and thus are not entitled to any evidentiary weight. *See INS v. Phinpathya*, 464 U.S. 183, 188-89 n.6 (1984); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1980).

On appeal, counsel contends that it is relevant information to consider that the beneficiary was previously granted L-1 nonimmigrant status. The AAO notes that, regardless of the fact that the petitioner had an L-1 petition approved on behalf of the same beneficiary, the fact remains that each nonimmigrant and immigrant petition is a separate record of proceeding with a separate burden of proof and as such, each petition must stand on its own individual merits. USCIS is not required to assume the burden of searching through previously provided evidence submitted in support of other petitions to determine the approvability of this petition. The approval of a nonimmigrant petition in no way guarantees that USCIS will approve an immigrant petition filed on behalf of the same beneficiary. USCIS denies many I-140 immigrant petitions after approving prior nonimmigrant I-129 L-1 petitions. *See, e.g., Q Data Consulting, Inc. v. INS*, 293 F. Supp. 2d at 25; *IKEA US v. US Dept. of Justice*, 48 F. Supp. 2d 22 (D.D.C. 1999); *Fedin Brothers Co. Ltd. v. Sava*, 724 F. Supp. 1103 (E.D.N.Y. 1989).

If the previous nonimmigrant petition was approved based on the same unsupported assertions that are contained in the current record, the approval would constitute material and gross error on the part of the director. The AAO is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. *See, e.g. Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 597 (Comm. 1988). It would be

absurd to suggest that USCIS or any agency must treat acknowledged errors as binding precedent. *Sussex Engg. Ltd. v. Montgomery*, 825 F.2d 1084, 1090 (6th Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 485 U.S. 1008 (1988).

Beyond the decision of the director, the record lacks substantive job descriptions establishing what job duties the beneficiary performed during his employment abroad. Conclusory assertions regarding the beneficiary's employment capacity are not sufficient. Merely repeating the language of the statute or regulations does not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. *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); *Avyr Associates, Inc. v. Meissner*, 1997 WL 188942 at *5 (S.D.N.Y.). The actual duties themselves will reveal the true nature of the employment. *Fedin Bros. Co., Ltd. v. Sava*, 724 F. Supp. at 1108.

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). Based on the additional grounds of ineligibility noted above, this petition cannot be approved.

The appeal will be dismissed 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. The petition is revoked.