

**PUBLIC COPY**




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy




D2

FILE: WAC 01 049 53323 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date **JUN 21 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.

*Mari Johnson*

 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 travel agency that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a contract 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 is unique and complex. He also states that the nature of the duties are specific, specialized and complex since the beneficiary would be negotiating contracts with high level corporate businesses. Finally, counsel asserts that the petitioner has not had success with hiring people without a degree, and that the position requires education and knowledge that can only be acquired through a degree in business.

Counsel's submission 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).

On motion, counsel submits a statement that essentially repeats the information submitted on appeal. Counsel's statement is not persuasive. 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. § 1003.2(c)(1). Here, nothing in the motion contains new facts that were previously unavailable. No documentary evidence was submitted with the motion.

The evidence also fails to satisfy the requirements of a motion to reconsider. Counsel does not supply 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 May 19, 2003, is affirmed. The petition is denied.