

PUBLIC COPY

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

BA

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536



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



FILE: [REDACTED]
EAC 01 235 54507


Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: APR 09 2004

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

PETITION: Petition for Special Immigrant Battered Spouse pursuant to Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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.

Mari Johnson

RS
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). A motion to reconsider was timely filed. The matter is now again before the AAO. The motion will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of Korea who is seeking classification as a special immigrant pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii), as the battered spouse of a United States citizen. The director denied the petition, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that he: (1) has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage; or is the parent of a child who has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage; and (2) entered into the marriage to the citizen or lawful permanent resident in good faith. The AAO dismissed the appeal on February 28, 2003. Counsel for the petitioner timely filed a motion to reconsider.

On motion, counsel submits a brief asserting that the petitioner qualifies for the classification sought as the battered spouse of a United States citizen.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) states, in pertinent part:

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 Service policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision.

Although counsel has submitted a motion entitled "Motion to Reconsider," counsel does not submit any document that would meet the requirements of a motion to reconsider. Counsel does not cite any precedent decisions in support of a motion to reconsider. Counsel does not argue that the previous decisions were based on an incorrect application of law or Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) policy. Counsel restates the evidence presented with the petition and prior appeal.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) states, in pertinent part: "[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."

Based on the plain meaning of "new," a new fact is found to be evidence that was not available and could not have been discovered or presented in the previous proceeding.¹

On motion, counsel for the petitioner has submitted a brief.

A review of the brief that the petitioner submits on motion reveals no fact that could be considered "new" under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). All evidence submitted was previously available and could have been discovered or presented in the previous proceeding.

Motions for the reopening of immigration proceedings are disfavored for the same reasons as are petitions for rehearing and motions for a new trial on the basis of newly discovered evidence. *INS v. Doherty*, 502 U.S. 314, 323 (1992)(citing *INS v. Abudu*, 485 U.S. 94 (1988)). A party seeking to reopen a proceeding bears a "heavy burden." *INS v. Abudu*, 485 U.S. at 110.

¹ The word "new" is defined as "1. having existed or been made for only a short time . . . 3. Just discovered, found, or learned <new evidence>" WEBSTER'S II NEW RIVERSIDE UNIVERSITY DICTIONARY 792 (1984)(emphasis in original).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4) states that "[a] motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed." Accordingly, the motion will be dismissed, the proceedings will not be reopened, and the previous decisions of the director and the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion is dismissed.