



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: **MAY 06 2013** OFFICE: NEBRASKA 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,


Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center. The subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and motion to reconsider. The motions will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a wood refinishing business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a wood refinisher as a skilled worker or professional pursuant to Section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A). As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage and denied the petition on April 3, 2009. The AAO affirmed the director's denial on January 10, 2011.

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 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. All evidence submitted on motion was previously available and could have been discovered or presented in the previous proceeding. The petitioner submits its 2003 tax returns on motion and asserts that it thought these were previously submitted. No explanation for the previous unavailability of this evidence was provided. Although counsel asserts that another entity controlled and prepared the beneficiary's financial filings in the past, the assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). The evidence submitted on motion is not "new" and will not be considered a proper basis for a motion to reopen. Accordingly, the motion to reopen is dismissed.

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) state, 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."

Counsel asserts on motion that "there are material factual or legal errors" in the AAO's previous decision. However, counsel did not identify those errors or present any precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy. The petitioner's 2003 tax return fails to demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage in all relevant years. Further, the AAO noted in its dismissal of the appeal that the petitioner had filed another I-140 petition and that the petitioner must demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage for

¹The 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).

each beneficiary. On motion, counsel states only that the petitioner did petition for three individuals but only the instant beneficiary remains. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). As the petitioner has failed to identify any errors in the AAO's decision or present any precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy, the motion to reconsider is 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 met that burden.

ORDER: The motion to reopen and motion to reconsider are dismissed. The appeal remains dismissed. The petition remains denied.