

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]

B2

DATE: NOV 29 2012 OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Alien of Extraordinary Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)

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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition on March 15, 2011. The Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed the petitioner's appeal of that decision on July 11, 2012. The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and motion to reconsider. The motions will be dismissed, the previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed, and the petition will remain denied.

In order to properly file a motion, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(iii) requires that the motion must be "[a]ccompanied by a statement about whether or not the validity of the unfavorable decision has been or is the subject of any judicial proceeding and, if so, the court, nature, date, and status or result of the proceeding." Furthermore, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4) requires that "[a] motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. In this case, the petitioner failed to submit a statement regarding if the validity of the decision of the AAO has been or is subject of any judicial proceeding. As such, the motions must be dismissed pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

Notwithstanding the above, in the decision of the AAO dismissing the petitioner's original appeal, the AAO specifically and thoroughly discussed the petitioner's evidence and found that the petitioner failed to establish that he meets a single one of the regulatory criteria pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).

On motion, counsel submitted a brief which generally reasserts previous claims and additional evidence.

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.¹

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) and, therefore, cannot be considered a proper basis for a motion to reopen.

On motion, counsel asserts that a "declaration" from [REDACTED] which states that she "ha[s] read and seen the article" which appeared in "*Entrepreneur Magazine Philippines*," is "evidence" of published material about the petitioner.

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).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(2) provides:

Submitting secondary evidence and affidavits. (i) General. The non-existence or other unavailability of required evidence creates a presumption of ineligibility. If a required document, such as a birth or marriage certificate, does not exist or cannot be obtained, an applicant or petitioner must demonstrate this and submit secondary evidence, such as church or school records, pertinent to the facts at issue. If secondary evidence also does not exist or cannot be obtained, the applicant or petitioner must demonstrate the unavailability of both the required document and relevant secondary evidence, and submit two or more affidavits, sworn to or affirmed by persons who are not parties to the petition who have direct personal knowledge of the event and circumstances. Secondary evidence must overcome the unavailability of primary evidence, and affidavits must overcome the unavailability of both primary and secondary evidence.

Where the regulations require specific, objective evidence of achievements, such as published material, the primary evidence would be copies of the articles themselves. Affidavits attesting to publications, therefore, would need to “overcome the unavailability of both primary and secondary evidence.” The submitted “declaration” does not satisfy the requirements above and, therefore, the petitioner is presumed ineligible pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(2). As a result, this cannot be considered new evidence.

All of the remaining submitted evidence relates to achievements that postdate the filing date of the original petition on March 11, 2010. Eligibility must be established at the time of filing. Therefore, the AAO will not consider these items as evidence to establish the petitioner’s eligibility. 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(1), (2); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg’l Comm’r 1971). A petition cannot be approved at a future date after the petitioner becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 175 (Comm’r 1998). That decision further provides, citing *Matter of Bardouille*, 18 I&N Dec. 114 (BIA 1981), that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) cannot “consider facts that come into being only subsequent to the filing of a petition.” *Id.* at 176.

As stated above, a review of the evidence that the petitioner submits on motion reveals no fact relating to achievements predating the filing of the petition that could be considered “new” under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). Therefore, the documents cannot be considered 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 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 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. See *Matter of Medrano*, 20 I&N Dec. 216, 220 (BIA 1990, 1991). 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 could not have been addressed by the party. Further, a motion to reconsider is not a process by which a party may submit, in essence, the same brief presented on appeal and seek reconsideration by generally alleging error in the prior decision. *Matter of O-S-G-*, 24 I&N Dec. 56, 58 (BIA 2006). 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. *Id.* at 60.

The motion to reconsider does not allege the application of precedent to a novel situation, or that there is new precedent or a change in law that affects the AAO's prior decision. As noted above, a motion to reconsider must include specific allegations as to how the AAO erred as a matter of fact or law in its prior decision, and it must be supported by pertinent legal authority. Because counsel has failed to raise such allegations of error in his motion to reconsider, the AAO will dismiss the motion to reconsider.

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 July 11, 2012 is affirmed, and the petition remains denied.