

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals, MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



Dg

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 22 2010

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]  
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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

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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently \$585, but will increase to \$630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the \$630 fee. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must 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 nonimmigrant visa petition, and the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed the petitioner's subsequent appeal. The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The AAO will dismiss the motion.

The petitioner filed the nonimmigrant petition seeking to classify the beneficiary as an athlete under section 101(a)(15)(P)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(P)(i), for a period of five years. The petitioner, a martial arts school, seeks to employ the beneficiary temporarily in the United States as a P-1 athlete in the position of "Taekwondo Athletic/Instructor."

The director denied the petition, concluding that the petitioner failed to establish: (1) that the beneficiary seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of performing as an athlete with respect to a specific athletic competition; and (2) that the beneficiary will participate in an athletic competition which requires participation of an athlete that has an international reputation. The director further found that the petitioner had failed to submit a consultation from an appropriate labor organization. The AAO dismissed the petitioner's appeal on January 14, 2010, and affirmed the denial of the petition on all stated grounds.

The petitioner filed the instant motion to reopen on February 12, 2010. In an attachment to the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, the petitioner states:

Applicant in this Motion to Reopen requests the Service to review the Applicant's credentials, resubmitted with this Motion, with the following P visa criteria listed on the Service Website. The Applicant maintains that the Service is in error on its conclusion that the applicant is not eligible for the P visa based on its own set of criteria listed in its denial letter of January 14, 2010. The Applicant request the Service to review his credentials affirmatively. . . .

The petitioner provides copies of previously submitted evidence and indicates that all eligibility requirements for P-1 status, as posted on the USCIS public website, have been met.

Although the petitioner acknowledges the AAO's dismissal of the petitioner's appeal, the brief contains no direct reference to the specific findings made in the AAO's 10-page decision issued on January 14, 2010. Rather, counsel essentially requests that the AAO conduct a *de novo* review of the record.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) states:

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.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) states:

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.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4) states, in pertinent part: "A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed."

The instant motion consists of the above-referenced statement from the petitioner and copies of previously submitted evidence. There is no reference made to the findings made in the AAO's decision and the specific deficiencies remarked upon therein, no new facts provided to support a motion to reopen, and no specific reasons stated for reconsideration. Accordingly, the motion will be dismissed for failing to meet the applicable requirements.

The purpose of a motion to reopen or motion to reconsider is different from the purpose of an appeal. While the AAO conducts a comprehensive, *de novo* review of the entire record on appeal, a review in the case of a motion to reopen is strictly limited to an examination of any new facts, which must be supported by affidavits and documentary evidence. A motion for reconsideration must state the reasons for re-consideration and be supported by pertinent precedent decisions establishing that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or USCIS policy. As such, counsel's previously submitted arguments based on the Service Center director's original decision cannot be considered "new" facts or provide a reason for reconsideration of the AAO's appellate decision. The AAO previously conducted a *de novo* review of the entire record of proceeding and has already addressed the arguments contained in counsel's brief. There is no regulatory or statutory provision that allows a petitioner more than one appellate decision per petition filed. In the present matter, an appellate decision was issued and the deficiencies were expressly stated.

Rather, the AAO's review in this matter is limited to the narrow issue of whether the petitioner has presented and documented new facts or documented sufficient reasons, supported by pertinent precedent decisions, to warrant the re-opening or reconsideration of the AAO's decision issued on January 14, 2010. In the current proceeding, counsel has not even explicitly acknowledged the grounds stated for dismissal of the appeal, much less attempted to overcome them.

In addition, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 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." The petitioner's motion does not contain this statement. 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 does 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 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.

As a final note, the proper filing of a motion to reopen and/or reconsider does not stay the AAO's prior decision to dismiss an appeal or extend a beneficiary's previously set departure date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(iv).

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.