




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services


(b)(6)



DATE: JUN 18 2013

OFFICE: NEBRASKA 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Acting 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 October 3, 2012, the AAO dismissed the appeal. Counsel to the petitioner filed a motion to reopen 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 November 23, 2012, 51 days after the AAO's October 3, 2012 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.

Current counsel asserts that the motion is untimely filed because of "delays caused by previous legal counsel." However, the petitioner did not properly articulate a claim for ineffective assistance of counsel under *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I&N Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), *affd*, 857 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1988). A claim based upon ineffective assistance of counsel requires the affected party to, *inter alia*, file a complaint with the appropriate disciplinary authorities or, if no complaint has been filed, to explain why not. The instant motion does not address these requirements. The petitioner does not explain the facts surrounding the preparation of the motion or the engagement of its former representative. Accordingly, the petitioner did not articulate a proper claim based upon ineffective assistance of counsel.

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.¹

¹ The AAO notes that, even if the motion were timely, the petitioner presented no facts or evidence on motion that may be considered "new" under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) and that could be considered a proper basis for a motion to reopen. 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.¹

In this matter, the motion was supported by a statement from the petitioner and copies of the petitioner's bank statements from October 27, 2006, through December 31, 2006. All evidence submitted on motion was previously available and could have been discovered or presented in the previous proceeding. Therefore, the evidence submitted on motion would not be considered "new" and would not be considered a proper basis for a motion to reopen.

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.