

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy  
**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

[Redacted]

D13

Date: **APR 24 2012**

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

[Redacted]

PETITION: Nonimmigrant Petition for Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(R)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(R)(1)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[Redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, California Service Center, denied the employment-based nonimmigrant visa petition. On appeal, the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) remanded the matter for issuance of a new decision. The director again denied the petition and certified her decision to the AAO, who affirmed the director's certified decision. The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and a motion to reconsider. The motions will be dismissed, the previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed, and the petition will remain denied.

The petitioner is seeking to reopen and reconsider the AAO's August 11, 2011 decision affirming the director's denial of the petition because the petitioner had failed to establish that it is a bona fide nonprofit religious organization as defined by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(r)(3). The AAO determined that the petitioner had failed to submit a currently valid determination letter from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) establishing the petitioner as a bona fide nonprofit religious organization or documentation in accordance with by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(r)(9) to establish that it was covered under an IRS determination letter granting group exemption to the petitioner's parent organization.

On motion, counsel renews her argument that the petitioner has submitted sufficient documentation to establish its bona fides as a nonprofit religious organization. Counsel provides a copy of a September 8, 2011 form a certified public accountant (CPA) that his firm "has been engaged to prepare [IRS] Form 1023 (Application for Recognition of Exemption Under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code) on behalf of [the petitioning organization]. The CPA also opined that the IRS will grant the exemption.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be provided and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). 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.<sup>1</sup>

A review of the evidence that the petitioner submits on motion reveals no fact that could be considered "new" under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). On appeal, the petitioner simply submits a letter evidencing its initiation of the paperwork to obtain IRS certification of its tax-exempt status. The petitioner's motion is not an opportunity for the petitioner to correct its own defects in the record. The petitioner was previously put on notice and provided with reasonable and numerous opportunities to provide the required evidence. A letter indicating that the petitioner is now in the process of obtaining the required documentation is not "new" evidence and is not a proper basis for a motion to reopen.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 NEW COLLEGE DICTIONARY, (3d Ed 2008). (emphasis in original).

reopen a proceeding bears a “heavy burden.” *INS v. Abudu*, 485 U.S. at 110. With the current motion, the petitioner has not met that burden. The motion to reopen will be dismissed.

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 U.S. Citizenship and Immigration (USCIS) policy. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3). A motion to reconsider contests the correctness of the original decision based on the previous factual record, as opposed to a motion to reopen which seeks a new hearing based on new or previously unavailable evidence. *See Matter of Cerna*, 20 I&N Dec. 399, 403 (BIA 1991).

A motion to reconsider cannot be used to raise a legal argument that could have been raised earlier in the proceedings. Rather, the “additional legal arguments” that may be raised in a motion to reconsider should flow from new law or a *de novo* legal determination reached in its decision that may not have been addressed by the party. A motion to reconsider is not a process by which a party may submit, for example, the same brief presented on appeal and seek reconsideration by generally alleging error in the prior decision. Instead, the moving party must specify the factual and legal issues raised on appeal that were decided in error or overlooked in the initial decision or must show how a change in law materially affects the prior decision. *See Matter of Medrano*, 20 I&N Dec. 216, 219 (BIA 1990, 1991).

In this case, the petitioner failed to support its motion with any legal argument or precedent decisions to establish that the AAO decision was based on an incorrect application of law or USCIS policy. The motion to reconsider will be dismissed.

The burden of proof in visa petition proceedings remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the petitioner has not sustained that burden.

**ORDER:** The motion to reopen and the motion to reconsider are dismissed, the decision of the AAO dated August 11, 2011 is affirmed, and the petition remains denied.