

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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

PUBLIC COPY



B6

Date: **MAY 14 2012**

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Other, Unskilled Worker Pursuant to § 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.

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 with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a 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,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed this denial to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), and, on November 16, 2010, the AAO dismissed the appeal. Counsel to the petitioner filed an appeal; however, a dismissal of an appeal, allows the petitioner only to file a motion to reopen or reconsider. The appeal will be treated as a motion to reopen and reconsider the AAO's decision in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. The motion will be dismissed pursuant to 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.5(a)(1)(i), 103.5(a)(1)(iii)(C), 103.5(a)(3), and 103.5(a)(4).

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) regulations require that motions to reconsider be filed within 30 days of the underlying decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i). Similarly, USCIS regulations require that motions to reopen be filed within 30 days of the underlying decision, except that failure to timely file a motion to reopen may be excused in the discretion of USCIS where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and was beyond the affected party's control. *Id.* In this matter, the motion was filed on December 23, 2010, or 37 days after the AAO's November 16, 2010 decision. The record indicates that the AAO's decision was mailed to both the petitioner at its address of record and to its counsel of record. As the record does not establish that the failure to file the motion within 30 days of the decision was reasonable and beyond the affected party's control, the motion is untimely and must be dismissed for that reason.

Furthermore, the motion shall be dismissed for failing to meet an applicable requirement. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.5(a)(1)(iii) lists the filing requirements for motions to reopen and motions to reconsider.¹ Section 103.5(a)(1)(iii)(C) requires that motions be "[a]ccompanied by a

¹ The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 provides 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." "New" facts are those that were not available and could not reasonably have been discovered or presented in the previous proceeding. A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

A motion to reconsider must: (1) 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; and (2) establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3). A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

Counsel stated on appeal that additional evidence and a brief would be filed within thirty days. To date, more than one year and four months after the filing of the appeal, no brief or additional evidence has been received. Even if the filing was timely, it would not meet the requirements of a motion to reopen as nothing states new facts to be provided in the reopened proceeding supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Similarly, the filing would not meet the requirements of a motion to reconsider as it does not state the reasons for reconsideration supported by pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or [USCIS] policy. Nor does the late filing establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. Even if the filing was timely, and it is not, the motion would be denied as it does not overcome the AAO's original finding that the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onward.

statement about whether or not the validity of the unfavorable decision has been or is the subject of any judicial proceeding." In this matter, the motion does not contain the statement required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(iii)(C). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4) states that a motion which does not meet applicable requirements must be dismissed. Therefore, because the instant motion did not meet the applicable filing requirements listed in 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(iii)(C), it must also be dismissed for this reason.

Motions for the reopening or reconsideration 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. *See 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 will be dismissed.

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. Accordingly, the motion will be dismissed, the proceedings will not be reopened or reconsidered, and the previous decisions of the director and the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion is dismissed.

As noted in the AAO's November 16, 2010 decision, the petitioner failed to submit tax returns for [REDACTED] in 2002, 2003, or 2004. The petitioner failed to submit tax returns for [REDACTED] in any tax year. The tax returns submitted fail to establish the ability to pay the proffered wage plus the petitioner's personal living expenses in any year from the priority date onward. The record does not establish that the petitioner had liquefiable personal assets which could have assisted them in paying the proffered wage plus applicable living expenses. None of these issues were addressed in the petitioner's subsequent appeal and no documentation was submitted to address these deficiencies.