



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

31

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 13 2004


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

PETITION: Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON 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.

  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**PUBLIC COPY**

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

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center. The Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed a subsequent appeal. The matter is now before the AAO on motion. The motion will be dismissed.

The AAO dismissed the appeal on May 3, 2002. On June 4, 2002, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) received a Motion to Reopen and fee from counsel requesting additional time of at least 120 days for the submission of new and additional information in support of the petition.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(vii) allows for limited circumstances in which a petitioner can supplement an already-submitted appeal. That regulation, however, applies only to appeals, and not to motions to reopen or reconsider. There is no analogous regulation which allows a petitioner to submit new evidence in furtherance of a previously-filed motion.

According to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2), a motion to reopen must state the new facts to be provided in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. According to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3), a motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or CIS policy.

The petitioner has not filed a proper motion to reopen or reconsider. His request was not accompanied by any evidence or arguments based on precedent decisions. A request for motion must meet the regulatory requirements of a motion to reopen or reconsider *at the time it is filed*; no provision exists for the CIS to grant an extension in order to await future correspondence that may or may not include evidence or arguments.

**ORDER:** The motion is dismissed.