


identifying data deleted to
prevent unauthorized access
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Room A3042
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



FEB 14 2005

FILE:




EAC 03 008 52477

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date:

IN RE:


Petitioner:



Beneficiary

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic who is seeking classification as a special immigrant pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 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 she has resided with the U.S. citizen spouse, is a person of good moral character, and entered into the marriage to the citizen in good faith.

On motion, counsel submits additional evidence and the petitioner's statement that the reason she failed to respond to the director's request for additional evidence was that she was ill. She does not elaborate or explain the nature of her illness and how she was prevented from responding to the service center's request for evidence during the allotted 60-day period.

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 additional evidence.

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.

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.

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).