

(b)(6)

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

DATE: **DEC 04 2012** OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

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.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ron Rosenberg for".

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: On January 21, 2010, the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed an appeal to the denial of an employment-based preference visa petition by the Director, Texas Service Center (TSC). The matter is now before the AAO again on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The petitioner is a residential care facility for the elderly. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a human resources manager pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3). As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage from 2006 onwards. The director denied the petition accordingly on June 1, 2007.

The petitioner subsequently filed a timely appeal on June 28, 2007.

As noted above, on January 21, 2010, AAO dismissed the petitioner's appeal upholding the director's decision to deny the petition. The reasons for the dismissal of the appeal are set forth in the AAO's decision.

The petitioner subsequently attempted to file another appeal on February 19, 2010, indicating that a brief and/or additional evidence would be forthcoming within 30 days. The AAO, however, does not exercise appellate jurisdiction over its own decisions. The AAO only exercises appellate jurisdiction over matters that were specifically listed at 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii) (as in effect on February 28, 2003).¹ For instance, in the event that a petitioner disagrees with an AAO decision to dismiss an appeal, the petitioner can file a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. In this matter, the AAO would have had jurisdiction over a timely motion if the petitioner had checked box D ("I am filing a motion to reopen a decision"), box E ("I am filing a motion to reconsider a decision"), or box F ("I am filing a motion to reopen and a motion to reconsider a decision") on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion. In this case, the petitioner's checked box B ("I am filing an appeal"), instead. Therefore, the appeal is improperly filed and must be rejected on this basis pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(1).

¹ In the process of reorganizing the immigration regulations, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) deleted the list of the AAO's appellate jurisdiction that was previously found at former 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii) (2002). 68 Fed. Reg. 10922 (March 6, 2003). DHS replaced the appellate jurisdiction provision with a general delegation of authority, granting U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) the authority to adjudicate the appeals that had been previously listed in the regulations as of February 28, 2003. See DHS Delegation No. 0150.1 para. (2)(U) (Mar. 1, 2003); 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(iv). As a result, there is no generally accessible list of the AAO's jurisdiction that may be cited in immigration proceedings or in federal court.

Therefore, as the appeal was not properly filed, it will be rejected.²

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The AAO's previous decision dated January 21, 2010 shall not be disturbed.

² Even if the AAO were to treat the appeal as a motion, it would be dismissed for failing to meet applicable requirements. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4). Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2), 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. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3), 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. As noted above, the petitioner stated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted in 30 days. Although a brief and additional evidence were subsequently submitted by counsel, this documentation could not have been considered in the context of a motion. Evidence and briefs must be submitted with the motion. Unlike appeals, the regulation pertaining to motions to reopen or reconsider does not permit briefs and/or evidence to be filed subsequently.