

(b)(6)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

DATE: **MAY 31 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 motion to reopen and motion to reconsider. The motions will be dismissed. The petition will remain denied.

The petitioner describes itself as a coffee processing and sales business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a coffee operations manager. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. The director denied the petition accordingly. The AAO affirmed the director's decision and also determined that the appellant did not qualify as a successor-in-interest to the petitioner.

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 appellant 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. It is further noted that the petitioner has submitted evidence with this motion that was originally requested by the AAO in a Notice of Derogatory Information dated May 25, 2012. As the petitioner was previously put on notice and provided with a reasonable opportunity to provide the required evidence, the evidence submitted on motion will not be considered "new" and will not be considered a proper basis for a motion to reopen.

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.. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3). The appellant stated on motion that the "former immigration attorney did not have correct information and did not fully represent this case."

Although the appellant claims that its counsel was incompetent, in this matter, the appellant 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

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).

authorities or, if no complaint has been filed, to explain why not. The instant motion does not address these requirements. The appellant does not explain the facts surrounding the preparation of the appeal or the engagement of the representative. Accordingly, the appellant did not articulate a proper claim based upon ineffective assistance of counsel.

As the appellant has not alleged or identified a misapplication of law or policy by the AAO, the statements cannot be considered a proper basis for a motion to reconsider.

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 met that burden.

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