

identifying law enforcement to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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

D13



Date: **SEP 27 2012**

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: 

IN RE:

Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Nonimmigrant Petition for Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(R)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(R)(1)

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,


Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the employment-based nonimmigrant visa petition. The Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed a subsequent appeal. The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The motion will be dismissed, the previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed, and the petition will remain denied.

The petitioner is a church. It seeks to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant religious worker under section 101(a)(15)(R)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(R)(1) to perform services as a pastor/missionary. The AAO affirmed the director's determination that the petitioner had not established that it qualifies as a bona fide nonprofit religious organization exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC). The AAO also found that the petitioner had not established how it intends to compensate the beneficiary.

On motion, the petitioner states that it has now received a letter from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) showing that the petitioner is exempt from taxation and that it has redone its budget to include compensation for the beneficiary.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be provided and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). 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

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). The petitioner submits a copy of a January 8, 2012 letter from the IRS granting it tax-exempt status under sections 501(c)(3) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi) of the IRC. The petitioner also submitted a copy of its budget for January through December 2012 that includes a line item for the beneficiary's "support." The petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(1), (12); *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg'l Comm'r 1978).

The regulations and Form I-129 clearly notify the petitioner of the required evidence and the director gave the petitioner a reasonable opportunity to provide it for the record before the visa petition was adjudicated. The petitioner failed to submit the requested evidence and now submits it on motion. The AAO will not consider this evidence for any purpose. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). The appeal will be adjudicated based on the record of proceeding before the director.

¹ 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 NEW COLLEGE DICTIONARY, (3d Ed 2008). (emphasis in original).

Motions for the reopening of immigration proceedings are disfavored for the same reasons as are 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. With the current motion, the petitioner has not met that burden. The petitioner has submitted no new evidence that the AAO’s previous decision was in error. The motion to reopen will therefore be dismissed.

The burden of proof in visa petition proceedings remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The motion to reopen is dismissed, the decision of the AAO dated February 27, 2012 is affirmed, and the petition remains denied.