




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)



Date:

MAR 25 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,

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed the decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The AAO dismissed the appeal. Counsel filed the instant motion to reconsider the AAO's decision. The motion will be dismissed.

The petitioner describes itself as a restaurant. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a cook. 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 petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the U.S. Department of Labor (the DOL).

The director's decision denying the petition concluded that the beneficiary did not possess the required experience for the offered position as set forth on the Form ETA 750, and the petitioner did not possess the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage. The AAO affirmed the director's decision on appeal.

Counsel filed the instant motion to reconsider on December 21, 2011. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) states:

*Requirements for motion to reconsider.* 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 [U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)] 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.

On motion, counsel states that “[a]t a subsequent date [the] parties will be submitting citations to [the] appropriate statutes, regulations or precedent decision[s].” However, as of the date of this decision, counsel has not stated any reasons for reconsideration that are supported by pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or policy. Therefore, the motion does not meet the requirements of a motion to reconsider.

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 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. *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.

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, and the previous decisions of the director and the AAO will remain undisturbed.

**ORDER:** The motion to reconsider is dismissed.