



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: **APR 23 2013** 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:
[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,

Ronald McCormack

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed this denial to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), and, on November 22, 2011, the AAO dismissed the appeal. Counsel filed a motion to reconsider the AAO's decision in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. The motion will be dismissed.

The petitioner describes itself as a staffing and recruitment business. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a staff registered nurse. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a professional or skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A).

The director's decision denying the petition concludes that the petitioner failed to establish that it would accept a foreign degree equivalent on the ETA Form 90989.

The appeal was filed by [REDACTED] who did not submit a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative signed by the petitioner. On the Form I-290B, [REDACTED] claimed to represent the beneficiary as her attorney.¹

The regulation governing representation in filing immigration petitions and/or applications with United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) is found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(3), which provides in pertinent part that:

(3) *Representation.* An applicant or petitioner may be represented by an attorney in the United States, as defined in § 1.1(f) of this chapter, by an attorney outside the United States as defined in § 292.1(a)(6) of this chapter, or by an accredited representative as defined in § 292.1(a)(4) of this chapter.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 1.1(f) states:

The term *attorney* means any person who is eligible to practice law in, and is a member in good standing of the bar of, the highest court of any State, possession, territory, or Commonwealth of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, and

¹ The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii) states, in pertinent part:

(B) *Meaning of affected party.* For purposes of this section and sections 103.4 and 103.5 of this part, *affected party* (in addition to the Service) means the person or entity with legal standing in a proceeding. It does not include the beneficiary of a visa petition. An affected party may be represented by an attorney or representative in accordance with part 292 of this chapter.

The AAO notes that the Form I-290B states that counsel represents the beneficiary on motion. Although the record contains a Form G-28 signed by the petitioner on August 5, 2009, it does not appear that counsel represents the petitioner on motion. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii), only the petitioner and its attorney have standing in this matter.

is not under any order suspending, enjoining, restraining, disbaring, or otherwise restricting him or her in the practice of law.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 292.1(a)(6) encompasses the following type of foreign attorneys:

Attorneys outside the United States. An attorney, other than one described in 8 C.F.R. 1.1(f), who is licensed to practice law and is in good standing in a court of general jurisdiction of the country in which he or she resides and who is engaged in such practice, may represent parties in matters before [the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)], provided that he or she represents persons only in matters outside the geographical confines of the United States as defined in section 101(a)(38) of the Act, and that the DHS official before whom he or she wishes to appear allows such representation as a matter of discretion.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 292.1(a)(4) defines an accredited representative as a person representing an organization described in 8 C.F.R. § 292.2 who has been accredited by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 292.2 describes the processes by which the BIA (1) recognizes an organization as authorized to provide accredited representatives, and (2) accredits a person as a representative of a recognized organization.

On March 15, 2013, this office issued a notice indicating that effective March 4, 2010, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 292.4(a) required that a new Form G-28 “must be filed with an appeal filed with the [AAO].” 8 C.F.R. § 292.4(a) further requires that the Form G-28 “must be properly completed and signed by the petitioner, applicant or respondent to authorize representation in order for the appearance to be recognized by DHS.” The record, however, does not contain a properly executed Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Accredited Representative, signed by [REDACTED] and by an authorized official of the petitioning entity dated subsequent to the director’s decision and submitted to authorize [REDACTED] as the representative of the petitioner on appeal. As of the date of this decision, the AAO has not received a response to the request for a new Form G-28. Without a new, valid, and fully executed Form G-28, signed by an official of the petitioning entity, authorizing [REDACTED] to represent the petitioner, we cannot consider the appeal to have been properly filed. Therefore, we cannot consider [REDACTED] to be the petitioner’s attorney or representative of record.

The motion has not been filed by the petitioner, an authorized representative or any entity with legal standing in the proceeding, but rather by an unauthorized person. Therefore, the motion has not been properly filed and must be rejected. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(1).

Further, 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 29, 2011, 37 days after the AAO's November 22, 2011 decision. The record indicates that the AAO's decision was mailed to both the petitioner at its business address 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. Section 103.5(a)(1)(iii)(C) requires that motions 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." 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.

As the petitioner has not appeared in support of the appeal the motion to reconsider was filed late, 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.