

Identifying data deleted to prevent identity 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



By

DATE: JUN 21 2012

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER



IN RE:



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:

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,

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 New York company that is engaged in retail and it seeks to employ the beneficiary as its Chief Executive. 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 May 11, 2010, the director denied the petition based on the determination that the petitioner failed to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in a managerial or executive capacity.

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 in this proceeding is 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.

On the Form I-140, the beneficiary's job duties as Chief Executive were to "determine and formulate policies and provide the overall direction of [the petitioner] within the guidelines set up by a board of directors. Plan, direct, or coordinate operations at the highest level of management with the help of subordinate managers." In a letter of support, the petitioner further stated that the beneficiary "has been exceptional in negotiating with our suppliers and vendors [*sic*] terms beneficial to the company"; "represented the company with state and federal licensing agencies"; and "reviews business opportunities in this region and builds relationships with business brokers, bankers, real estate agents and franchise companies to expand the business holding of [the petitioner.]"

In response to the director's request for additional evidence, the petitioner stated that the minutes of meetings indicated an "unbroken chain of authority held by [the beneficiary] to the present date." The petitioner also stated the beneficiary is the Secretary, Treasurer and the Sole Director of the petitioner, and his "duties provide a wide latitude in decision making with regards to the operation of the corporation." The petitioner also provided an additional job description of the duties to be performed. The petitioner also listed the six employees and their educational level.

In response to the request for evidence, the petitioner submitted a new organizational chart for the petitioner that indicated the beneficiary as president who supervises two convenience stores. Each convenience store has the same manager and the same four clerks.

Upon review of the petition and evidence, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary would be employed in a managerial or executive capacity. 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). The petitioner's description of the job duties must clearly describe the duties to be performed by the beneficiary and indicate whether such duties are either in an executive or managerial capacity. *Id.*

The petitioner provided a vague and nonspecific description of the beneficiary's duties that fails to demonstrate what the beneficiary will do on a day-to-day basis. For example, the petitioner states vague duties such as the beneficiary has "wide latitude in decision making with regards to the operation of the corporation"; "determine and formulate policies and provide the overall direction of [the petitioner] within the guidelines set up by a board of directors"; and "plan, direct, or coordinate operations at the highest level of management with the help of subordinate managers." 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); *Ayvr Associates, Inc. v. Meissner*, 1997 WL 188942 at \*5 (S.D.N.Y.). The petitioner did not define the petitioner's goals and policies or the day-to-day activities performed by the beneficiary in reaching the business goals for the convenience store. 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. at 1108. The petitioner's descriptions of the beneficiary's position do not identify the actual duties to be performed, such that they could be classified as managerial or executive in nature.

The job description also includes several non-qualifying duties such as the beneficiary will be responsible for "research and develop new products and markets for company, this would include negotiating terms for soda, beer, wine, candy, cigarettes and wholesale groceries in meetings with vendors"; "negotiate terms with suppliers and vendors"; "meet with gasoline supplier"; "reviewing and researching new businesses"; and "represent [the petitioner] with state and federal licensing agencies for the beer license, food permit and gasoline sales." It appears that the beneficiary will be developing and marketing the services of the business, and negotiating contracts, rather than directing such activities through subordinate employees. 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 Intn'l.*, 19 I&N Dec. at 604.

An analysis of the nature of the petitioner's business undermines the petitioner's assertion that the beneficiary is employed in a managerial or executive capacity. On the I-140, the petitioner stated that it employed six employees. In response to the director's request for evidence, the petitioner submitted a new organizational chart for the petitioner. In the new chart, the beneficiary is the president that runs two convenience stores. The same manager and the same four clerks work in both stores. The petitioner also submitted Form W-2 for 2009 that indicated the salary for all of the employees listed on the organizational chart except for one. The three clerks received salaries of \$4054.81, \$6953.91 and \$11,580.00. Thus, it appears that the clerks were employed part-time. The same is true for the manager, who received a salary of \$15,255.00.

In addition, the petitioner does not explain how the president, one manager, and four clerks can operate two convenience stores that are open seven days a week for at least 14 hours a day. It is not clear how one manager can run the accounting, inventory, purchasing, customer service, human resources and all the management operations for two businesses. Although the beneficiary is not required to supervise personnel, if it is claimed that his duties involve supervising employees, the petitioner must establish that the subordinate employees are supervisory, professional, or managerial. See § 101(a)(44)(A)(ii) of the Act.

In evaluating whether the beneficiary manages professional employees, the AAO must evaluate whether the subordinate positions require a baccalaureate degree as a minimum for entry into the field of endeavor. Section 101(a)(32) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(32), states that "[t]he term *profession* shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries." The term "profession" contemplates knowledge or learning, not merely skill, of an advanced type in a given field gained by a prolonged course of specialized instruction and study of at least baccalaureate level, which is a realistic prerequisite to entry into the particular field of endeavor. *Matter of Sea*, 19 I&N Dec. 817 (Comm'r 1988); *Matter of Ling*, 13 I&N Dec. 35 (R.C. 1968); *Matter of Shin*, 11 I&N Dec. 686 (D.D. 1966).

The AAO must focus on the level of education required by the position, rather than the degree held by a subordinate employee. The possession of a bachelor's degree by a subordinate employee does not automatically lead to the conclusion that an employee is employed in a professional capacity as that term is defined above. The petitioner has not established that a bachelor's degree is actually necessary, for example, to perform the managerial and clerical work of the store manager and the clerks who are the beneficiary's subordinates.

The statutory definition of the term "executive capacity" focuses on a person's elevated position within a complex organizational hierarchy, including major components or functions of the organization, and that person's authority to direct the organization. Section 101(a)(44)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(44)(B). Under the statute, a beneficiary must have the ability to "direct the management" and "establish the goals and policies" of that organization. Inherent to the definition, the organization must have a subordinate level of managerial employees for the beneficiary to direct and the beneficiary must primarily focus on the broad goals and policies of the organization rather than the day-to-day operations

of the enterprise. An individual will not be deemed an executive under the statute simply because they have an executive title or because they "direct" the enterprise as the owner or sole managerial employee. The beneficiary must also exercise "wide latitude in discretionary decision making" and receive only "general supervision or direction from higher level executives, the board of directors, or stockholders of the organization." *Id.*

The beneficiary's job duties, as described by the petitioner, are not indicative of an employee who is primarily focused on the broad goals and policies of the organization. The fact that the beneficiary is a shareholder of the organization is insufficient to establish the beneficiary's employment in an executive capacity. 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). The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary is primarily engaged in directing and controlling a subordinate staff comprised of professional, managerial or supervisory employees, nor has it indicated that he is charged with managing an essential function of the petitioning organization. *See* section 101(a)(44)(A) of the Act. Therefore, the AAO is not persuaded that the beneficiary would be employed in a primarily managerial capacity.

The denial decision also stated that based on the beneficiary's ownership of the U.S. company, the beneficiary will not be an employee. In the documentation submitted with the petition, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary is the sole owner of both the foreign company and the petitioner. On appeal, the petitioner states that "new officers and directors were elected and a new ownership agreement changed the ownership of the petitioner." As evidence, the petitioner submits the Minutes of Special Meeting of Shareholders and Directors, dated June 8, 2010, that indicated a new ownership agreement whereby the petitioner is owned by the foreign company (40%), [REDACTED] (30%), and [REDACTED] (30%). Thus, the new ownership agreement no longer indicates that the foreign company has a qualifying relationship with the petitioner. Furthermore, the minutes of a meeting are insufficient evidence of the shareholders that have control over the foreign company. The petitioner failed to present articles of organization, agreements, amendments or any documentation to corroborate the claim made in this letter. 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) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm'r 1972)). Without full disclosure of all relevant documents, USCIS is unable to determine the elements of ownership and control.

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 grounds of ineligibility discussed above, this petition cannot be approved.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's *de novo* authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

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.