

PUBLIC COPY

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

D2




FILE: WAC 01 175 51426 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: FEB 5 2004

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

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 service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed a subsequent appeal. The matter is again before the AAO on motion to reopen or reconsider. The motion will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a dentist office that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a dental specialist. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 (a)(15)(H)(i)(b). The director denied the petition on the basis that the proffered position did not meet the definition of a specialty occupation. The AAO affirmed the director's findings.

On motion, counsel states that the proffered position resembles that of a health services manager, as described in the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, and as such, it requires a bachelor's degree for performance. Counsel asserts that the proposed duties are specialized and complex. The motion is essentially a reiteration of the points that the petitioner's former counsel brought up on appeal. No other documentation is submitted on motion.

Counsel's submission of a brief does not satisfy either the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider. A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). A motion to reconsider must: (1) 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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) policy; and (2) establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3).

As previously stated, a motion to reopen must state the new facts that will be proven if the matter is reopened, and must be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Generally, the new facts must be material and unavailable previously, and could not have been discovered earlier in the proceeding. See 8 C.F.R. § 3.2(c)(1). On motion, counsel does not allege new facts and submits no new evidence.

The evidence also fails to satisfy the requirements of a motion to reconsider. Although counsel states that the decision to deny the petition was an incorrect application of the law, he does not support his assertion by any pertinent precedent decisions, or establish that the director misinterpreted the evidence of record.

A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4). 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 met that burden.

ORDER: The motion is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO, dated June 19, 2002, is affirmed. The petition is denied.