





U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)



DATE **FEB 07 2013** OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 


IN RE:

Petitioner: 

Beneficiary: 

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.

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,

*Elizabeth 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 July 13, 2010, the AAO dismissed the appeal. Counsel to the petitioner filed a motion to 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)(2), 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.* The applicant incorrectly filed the appeal with the AAO on August 12, 2010. A motion is not properly filed until the field office receives it. The AAO returned the appeal to the petitioner and informed it that it had incorrectly filed the appeal with this office. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) received the motion on August 25, 2010<sup>1</sup>, or 43 days after the AAO's July 13, 2010 decision. The record indicates that the AAO's decision was mailed to both the petitioner 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 applicable requirements. The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) state, 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." 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.<sup>2</sup> 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). All evidence submitted was previously available and could have been discovered or presented in the previous proceeding.

Furthermore, 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) states, in pertinent part, that 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." Although counsel checked 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, the motion does not meet the requirements of a motion to reconsider. Counsel does not state any reasons for reconsideration nor cite any precedent decisions in support of a motion to reconsider. Counsel makes arguments on the Form I-290B that have been

---

<sup>1</sup> The motion would have been untimely filed even if it had been received on August 17, 2010, the day after the motion was mailed to the field office, or 35 days after the AAO's decision was issued.

<sup>2</sup>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).

previously considered and addressed on appeal. Counsel does not argue that the previous decisions of the director and the AAO were based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy.

In this matter, the motion does not meet the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). 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.