

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

B4

[REDACTED]

DATE: DEC 28 2012

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

[REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

[REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C)

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 of the Texas Service Center revoked the previously approved preference visa petition. The petitioner appealed the matter to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), where the appeal was dismissed. The AAO dismissed a subsequent motion to reconsider. The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and a motion to reconsider. The motion will be dismissed and the director's and the AAO's decisions will be undisturbed.

The petitioner is a Florida corporation that seeks to employ the beneficiary as its general manager. Accordingly, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C), as a multinational executive or manager.

The director revoked the previously approved petition because the director determined that the petitioner failed to respond to the Notice of Intent to Revoke (NOIR).

The petitioner subsequently filed an appeal which the AAO dismissed on December 8, 2009. The petitioner filed a motion to reconsider, which the AAO dismissed on December 9, 2011. On January 5, 2012, counsel for the petitioner filed Form I-290B and stated that the petitioner is filing a motion to reopen and reconsider.

On motion, counsel contends that the beneficiary hired a new attorney to represent him and his family at an interview "that was conducted by the INS." The new attorney presented a G-28 for the I-485, but not for the I-140; however, counsel states that the "record is replete with evidence that Tampa USCIS was aware that [REDACTED] was handling the whole case, as evidenced by the myriad correspondence between Tampa USCIS and the Firm." Counsel also admits that [REDACTED] never filed a G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance, on behalf of the petitioner for the Form I-140. Counsel states that the petitioner did not receive the NOIR, and instead it went to the attorney of record that was subsequently disbarred. Counsel explained that the petitioner has filed a complaint with disciplinary counsel against [REDACTED] in regard to his actions.

As a preliminary matter, the AAO notes that while an appeal and a motion are both remedial actions, the legal purpose of an appeal is entirely distinct from that of a motion to reopen/reconsider. The AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis, allowing the petitioner to supplement the record with any evidence or documentation that the filing party feels may overcome the grounds for the underlying adverse decision. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). However, the AAO's review of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider is limited to evidence that fits the specific criteria discussed at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) and 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3), respectively. Submitting evidence that does not fit the regulatory criteria specified at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) or 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3), depending on the type of motion the petitioner has filed, will not suffice even if such evidence may have overcome the grounds for denial if it have been submitted on appeal.

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) states, in pertinent part: "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.¹

On motion, counsel for the petitioner explained that the petitioner filed a complaint with "disciplinary counsel against Attorney [REDACTED] with regard to his actions." On motion, the petitioner provided a letter and a complaint form from the petitioner to the Florida Bar regarding the actions of [REDACTED]. The letter and complaint form are dated January 3, 2012.

Any appeal or motion based upon a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel requires: (1) that the claim be supported by an affidavit of the allegedly aggrieved respondent setting forth in detail the agreement that was entered into with counsel with respect to the actions to be taken and what representations counsel did or did not make to the respondent in this regard, (2) that counsel whose integrity or competence is being impugned be informed of the allegations leveled against him and be given an opportunity to respond, and (3) that the appeal or motion reflect whether a complaint has been filed with appropriate disciplinary authorities with respect to any violation of counsel's ethical or legal responsibilities, and if not, why not. *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I&N Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), *aff'd*, 857 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1988).

The petitioner did not submit evidence that [REDACTED] was informed of the allegations leveled against him and was not given an opportunity to respond. In addition, the petitioner did not provide sufficient evidence to establish that the complaint made by the petitioner to the Florida Bar was in fact filed and received by the Florida Bar.

Furthermore, the documentation submitted on motion included documents that could have been previously submitted. It is not clear why the petitioner did not file a complaint against the previous attorney earlier. 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). The evidence submitted was either previously available and could have been discovered or presented in the previous proceeding, or it post-dates the petition.

In addition, the motion does not satisfy the requirements of a motion to reconsider. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) states, in pertinent part:

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 Service policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision.

On motion, counsel does not submit any document that would meet the requirements of a motion to reconsider. A review of the record and the adverse decision indicates that the director and the AAO

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).

properly applied the statute and regulations to the petitioner's case. The petitioner's primary complaint is that it received ineffective assistance of prior counsel.

Upon review of the denial and the AAO's decisions, both the Director and AAO provided detailed statements of the grounds for denial and dismissal and cited to the specific provisions of the regulations as a basis for the decisions. A review of the record and the adverse decision indicates that the director and the AAO properly applied the statute and regulations to the petitioner's case. Both the director and the AAO's decisions have clearly outlined the missing information or inconsistent information and documentation, and explained that the record has insufficient evidence to establish eligibility for the benefit sought.

On motion, the petitioner does not establish that the AAO's decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy. The brief does not provide information or evidence that would support a motion to reconsider. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm'r 1972)).

In visa petition proceedings, the burden is on the petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit sought. *See Matter of Brantigan*, 11 I&N Dec. 493 (BIA 1966). The petitioner must prove by a preponderance of evidence that the beneficiary is fully qualified for the benefit sought. *Matter of Martinez*, 21 I&N Dec. 1035, 1036 (BIA 1997); *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, 79-80 (Comm. 1989); *Matter of Soo Hoo*, 11 I&N Dec. 151 (BIA 1965).

The "preponderance of the evidence" standard requires that the evidence demonstrate that the applicant's claim is "probably true," where the determination of "truth" is made based on the factual circumstances of each individual case. *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, 79-80 (Comm. 1989). In evaluating the evidence, *Matter of E-M-* also stated that "[t]ruth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality." *Id.* Thus, in adjudicating the application pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, the director must examine each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true.

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the petitioner submits relevant, probative, and credible evidence that leads the director to believe that the claim is "probably true" or "more likely than not," the applicant or petitioner has satisfied the standard of proof. *See U.S. v. Cardozo-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421 (1987) (defining "more likely than not" as a greater than 50 percent probability of something occurring). If the director can articulate a material doubt, it is appropriate for the director to either request additional evidence or, if that doubt leads the director to believe that the claim is probably not true, deny the application or petition.

Here, the submitted evidence does not meet the preponderance of the evidence standard. As noted in the director's decision and the AAO's decisions, the petitioner did not provide sufficient evidence to establish that the petitioner meets the regulatory requirements to establish eligibility for the benefit sought.

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 movant has not met that burden.

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. 8 CFR § 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 reconsidered, and the previous decisions of the director and the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion is dismissed. The director's and AAO's decisions will be undisturbed.