

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

D-7

File: EAC 08 025 50095 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **SEP 03 2008**

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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann", with a small "for" written below it.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont 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 visa petition seeking to extend the employment of the beneficiary 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 limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Georgia and is allegedly a watch wholesaler. The beneficiary was granted a one-year period of stay to open a new office in the United States, and the petitioner now seeks to extend the beneficiary's stay.

The director denied the petition concluding that the petitioner did not establish that the beneficiary will be employed in the United States in a primarily managerial or executive capacity.

The petitioner subsequently filed an appeal. The director declined to treat the appeal as a motion and forwarded the appeal to the AAO for review. On appeal, counsel to the petitioner asserts that the director erred and that the beneficiary will perform primarily qualifying duties.

To establish eligibility for the L-1 nonimmigrant visa classification, the petitioner must meet the criteria outlined in section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Act. Specifically, a qualifying organization must have employed the beneficiary in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity, or in a specialized knowledge capacity, for one continuous year within three years preceding the beneficiary's application for admission into the United States. In addition, the beneficiary must seek to enter the United States temporarily to continue rendering his or her services to the same employer or a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a managerial, executive, or specialized knowledge capacity.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(3) states that an individual petition filed on Form I-129 shall be accompanied by:

- (i) Evidence that the petitioner and the organization which employed or will employ the alien are qualifying organizations as defined in paragraph (l)(1)(ii)(G) of this section.
- (ii) Evidence that the alien will be employed in an executive, managerial, or specialized knowledge capacity, including a detailed description of the services to be performed.
- (iii) Evidence that the alien has at least one continuous year of full-time employment abroad with a qualifying organization within the three years preceding the filing of the petition.
- (iv) Evidence that the alien's prior year of employment abroad was in a position that was managerial, executive or involved specialized knowledge and that the alien's prior education, training, and employment qualifies him/her to perform the intended services in the United States; however, the work in the United States need not be the same work which the alien performed abroad.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(14)(ii) also provides that a visa petition, 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.

The primary issue in the present matter is whether the beneficiary will be employed by the United States entity in a primarily managerial or executive capacity.

Section 101(a)(44)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(44)(A), defines the term "managerial capacity" as 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), defines the term "executive capacity" as 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.

The petitioner does not clarify in the initial petition whether the beneficiary will primarily perform managerial duties under section 101(a)(44)(A) of the Act, or primarily executive duties under section 101(a)(44)(B) of the Act. A petitioner may not claim that a beneficiary will be employed as a hybrid "executive/manager" and rely on partial sections of the two statutory definitions. Given the lack of clarity, the AAO will assume that the petitioner is asserting that the beneficiary will be employed in either a managerial *or* an executive capacity and will consider both classifications.

The petitioner describes the beneficiary's proposed duties as "manager" of the two-employee operation in the Form I-129 as follows:

We currently have the need for a Manager to direct and coordinate activities of business, formulate company policies and goals, and exercise discretion over day-to-day operation of [the petitioner]. In this position, [the beneficiary] will interview and select individuals to fill managerial and staff vacancies, maintain [sic] employment of staff whose performance do not meet the company's proprietary standard. [The beneficiary] will also direct the compliance of workers with the company's established proprietary policies, procedures, and standards, such as safety, sanitation, financial budgets, and financial transactions. She will report directly to the Board of Directors for [the foreign employer] for financial transactions and personnel issues. Furthermore, she will review the operation records and reports to project sales and to determine company profitability. [The beneficiary] will be in charge of the day-to-day operation of [the petitioner]. [The beneficiary] has been chosen for this assignment based upon her managerial expertise and experience in financial management. [The beneficiary's] presence in the United States is needed to oversee the US subsidiary's overall marketing and sales areas to ensure the US subsidiary's overall marketing and sales areas.

The petitioner included a similar job description in its letter dated October 19, 2007.

On November 12, 2007, the director requested additional evidence. The director requested, *inter alia*, "evidence that establishes the duties" the beneficiary will perform in the United States, a description of the duties and educational requirements for each subordinate worker, and an organizational chart for the United States operation.

In response, the petitioner submitted a letter dated November 27, 2007 in which the petitioner provides a materially identical job description for the beneficiary. The petitioner also submitted an organizational chart indicating that the beneficiary will supervise a single employee, a "sales representative." Finally, the petitioner described the duties of the "sales representative" in a document titled "Description of the Staff" as follows:

[C]ontact new and existing customers to discuss their needs, and to explain how these needs could be met by specific products and services, answer customer's questions about products, quote prices, credit terms and other bid specifications.

While the petitioner claims that the beneficiary's position requires a bachelor's degree, the petitioner claims that the "sales representative" position requires only "[f]amiliarity with the products of [the petitioner]."

On December 19, 2007, the director denied the petition. The director concluded that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary will be employed primarily in a managerial or executive capacity.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the beneficiary will primarily perform qualifying duties in the United States. Counsel also claims that the beneficiary's supervision of the "sales representative" constitutes the supervision of a "professional."

Upon review, counsel's assertions are not persuasive.

Title 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(3)(v)(C) allows the "new office" operation one year within the date of approval of the petition to support an executive or managerial position. There is no provision in Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) regulations that allows for an extension of this one-year period. If the beneficiary is not performing qualifying duties within one year of petition approval, the petitioner is ineligible by regulation for an extension. Future hiring or business expansion plans may not be considered. A visa petition may not be approved based on speculation of future eligibility or after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *See Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm. 1971). In the instant matter, the petitioner has not established that the United States operation has reached the point that it can employ the beneficiary in a predominantly managerial or executive position.

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.* A petitioner cannot claim that some of the duties of the position entail executive responsibilities, while other duties are managerial. Again, a petitioner may not claim that a beneficiary will be employed as a hybrid "executive/manager" and rely on partial sections of the two statutory definitions.

In this matter, the petitioner's description of the beneficiary's job duties fails to establish that the beneficiary will act in a "managerial" or "executive" capacity. In support of the petition, the petitioner has submitted a vague and non-specific job description which fails to sufficiently describe what the beneficiary will do on a

day-to-day basis. For example, the petitioner states that the beneficiary will formulate policies and goals. However, the petitioner fails to specifically describe these policies and goals or explain what, exactly, the beneficiary will do to "coordinate" and "direct" business activities and worker compliance, or to be "in charge of the day-to-day operation," other than to act as a first-line supervisor of a single sales representative. The fact that the petitioner has given the beneficiary a managerial or executive title and has prepared a vague job description which includes inflated job duties does not establish that the beneficiary will actually perform managerial or executive duties. 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). Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Consequently, the record is not persuasive in establishing that the beneficiary will primarily perform qualifying duties in her operation of the business. As noted above, the petitioner asserts that the beneficiary will "manage" the petitioner's business operations through one subordinate sales representative. However, the record does not establish that the beneficiary will be relieved of the need to perform the non-qualifying tasks inherent to her ascribed duties by a subordinate staff. For example, the petitioner claims that the beneficiary will "review the operation records and reports to project sales and to determine company profitability." However, the petitioner does not explain who, other than the beneficiary, will produce these records and reports. Accordingly, it appears more likely than not that the beneficiary will primarily perform non-qualifying first-line supervisory, administrative, or operational tasks in her administration of the business. 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). A managerial employee must have authority over day-to-day operations beyond the level normally vested in a first-line supervisor, unless the supervised employees are professionals. 101(a)(44)(A)(iv) of the Act; see also *Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. at 604.

The petitioner has also failed to establish that the beneficiary will supervise and control the work of other supervisory, managerial, or professional employees, or will manage an essential function of the organization. As asserted in the record, the beneficiary will directly supervise a single sales representative who is described as performing sales tasks. Accordingly, it has not been established that this worker is a supervisory or managerial worker given that he does not supervise a subordinate staff. Furthermore, the job description provided for this worker indicates that he performs the tasks necessary to the provision of a service or the production of a product. Finally, as the petitioner failed to establish the education required to perform the duties of the subordinate position, even though this evidence was requested by the director, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary will manage a professional employee.¹ Failure to submit requested

¹In evaluating whether the beneficiary will manage 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

evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). In fact, despite counsel's argument on appeal, it appears that the "sales representative" position only requires familiarity with the petitioner's products and does not require an advanced degree. Furthermore, the unsupported statements of counsel on appeal 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). Accordingly, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary will be employed primarily in a managerial capacity.²

Similarly, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary will act in an "executive" capacity. 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. 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 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

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. 1988); *Matter of Ling*, 13 I&N Dec. 35 (R.C. 1968); *Matter of Shin*, 11 I&N Dec. 686 (D.D. 1966).

²While the petitioner has not argued that the beneficiary will manage an essential function of the organization, the record nevertheless would not support this position even if taken. 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. The term "essential function" is not defined by statute or regulation. If a petitioner claims that the beneficiary will manage 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 tasks related to the function. In this matter, the petitioner has not provided evidence that the beneficiary will manage an essential function. The petitioner's vague job description fails to document that the beneficiary's duties will be primarily managerial. Also, as explained above, the record indicates that the beneficiary will primarily be a first-line supervisor of a non-professional employee or will perform non-qualifying tasks. Absent a clear and credible breakdown of the time spent by the beneficiary performing her duties, the AAO cannot determine what proportion of her duties will be managerial, nor can it deduce whether the beneficiary will primarily perform the duties of a function manager. See *IKEA US, Inc. v. U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 48 F. Supp. 2d 22, 24 (D.D.C. 1999).

stockholders of the organization." *Id.* For the same reasons indicated above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary will act primarily in an executive capacity. The beneficiary's job description is so vague that it cannot be discerned what, exactly, the beneficiary will do on a day-to-day basis. As explained above, it appears more likely than not that the beneficiary will be primarily employed as a first-line supervisor and will perform the tasks necessary to produce a product or to provide a service. Therefore, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary will be employed primarily in an executive capacity.

In reviewing the relevance of the number of employees a petitioner has, federal courts have generally agreed that CIS "may properly consider an organization's small size as one factor in assessing whether its operations are substantial enough to support a manager." *Family, Inc. v. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services*, 469 F.3d 1313, 1316 (9th Cir. 2006) (citing with approval *Republic of Transkei v. INS*, 923 F.2d 175, 178 (D.C. Cir. 1991)); *Fedin Bros. Co. v. Sava*, 905 F.2d 41, 42 (2d Cir. 1990) (per curiam); *Q Data Consulting, Inc. v. INS*, 293 F. Supp. 2d 25, 29 (D.D.C. 2003)). Furthermore, it is appropriate for CIS to consider the size of the petitioning company in conjunction with other relevant factors, such as a company's small personnel size, the absence of employees who would perform the non-managerial or non-executive operations of the company, or a "shell company" that does not conduct business in a regular and continuous manner. *See, e.g. Systronics Corp. v. INS*, 153 F. Supp. 2d 7, 15 (D.D.C. 2001).

Accordingly, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary will primarily perform managerial or executive duties, and the petition may not be approved for that reason.³

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary was employed abroad in a position that was managerial or executive in nature. 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(l)(3)(iii) and (iv).

The petitioner described the beneficiary's job duties abroad in the Form I-129. As this job description is in the record, it will not be repeated verbatim here. Generally, the petitioner claims that the beneficiary devoted most of her time to preparing reports, analyzing costs, and other financial or administrative tasks. Furthermore, the petitioner submitted an organizational chart indicating that she supervised three persons abroad. Upon review, the record is not persuasive in establishing that the beneficiary was employed abroad in a primarily managerial or executive capacity. Similar to the United States position, it appears that the beneficiary primarily performed non-qualifying tasks abroad. Furthermore, to the extent the beneficiary was relieved of the need to perform some non-qualifying duties, it appears that the beneficiary served as a first-line supervisor, which is also a non-qualifying managerial duty. *See* sections 101(a)(44)(A) of the Act; *see also Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. at 604.

Accordingly, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary was employed abroad in a primarily managerial or executive capacity, and the petition may not be approved for this additional reason.

³It is noted that, in denying the petition, the director indicated that the beneficiary's proposed \$35,000.00 annual salary was "incongruous with that of an employee who is actually managing other bona fide managers or professionals." The AAO will withdraw this comment. The director's comment is not supported by the Act or by any pertinent regulations. However, that being said, and for the reasons set forth *supra*, the petitioner has nevertheless failed to establish that the beneficiary will be employed in the United States in a primarily managerial or executive position.

