

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



07

File: WAC 03 069 50055 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **SEP 05**

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:




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

IN 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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the petition for a nonimmigrant visa. The Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed the subsequently filed appeal and affirmed the director's decision to deny the petition. The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The AAO will dismiss the motion.

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant visa petition seeking to extend its authorization to employ the beneficiary as an L-1A nonimmigrant intracompany transferee pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). The petitioner is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California and is allegedly engaged in the business of international trade. The petitioner claims a qualifying relationship with [REDACTED] Corporation of Guangdong, China.

On March 18, 2003, the director denied the petition concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary had been employed abroad and would be employed in the United States in a primarily managerial or executive capacity. On April 18, 2003, the petitioner filed an appeal. The AAO dismissed the appeal on February 7, 2005. On March 4, 2005, the petitioner filed a motion to reopen the AAO's decision. On the Form I-290B appeal form, counsel to the petitioner asserts that "[w]e believe that the beneficiary has been and will be performing managerial duties." Counsel further states that a brief or evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. As of this date, the AAO has received nothing further and the record will be considered complete.¹

To establish eligibility under section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Act, the petitioner must meet certain criteria. Specifically, within three years preceding the beneficiary's application for admission into the United States, a firm, corporation, or other legal entity, or an affiliate or subsidiary thereof, must have employed the beneficiary for one continuous year. Furthermore, the beneficiary must seek to enter the United States temporarily to continue rendering his or her services to the same employer or a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a managerial, executive, or specialized knowledge capacity.

Upon review, the AAO will dismiss the motion to reopen.

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) state, in pertinent part, that "[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.²

¹ On July 24, 2006, the AAO sent a fax to counsel. The fax advised counsel that no evidence or brief had ever been received in this matter and requested that counsel submit a copy of the brief and/or additional evidence, if in fact such evidence had been submitted, within five business days. As of the date of this decision, the AAO has received no response from counsel or the petitioner.

² 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).

As noted above, only a single statement was submitted in support of the motion to reopen. As such, there is no evidence submitted on motion that may be considered "new" under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) and that could be considered a proper basis for a motion to reopen.

Motions for the reopening of immigration proceedings are disfavored for the same reasons as 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. With the current motion, the movant has not met that burden. The motion to reopen will be dismissed.

Finally, it should be noted for the record that, unless Citizenship and Immigration Services directs otherwise, the filing of a motion to reopen does not stay the execution of any decision in a case or extend a previously set departure date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(iv).

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. Title 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.