U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 37689455

Date: APR. 29, 2025

Motion on Administrative Appeals Office Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers (National Interest Waiver)

The Petitioner, an agronomist engineer, seeks employment-based second preference (EB-2) immigrant classification as either a member of the professions holding an advanced degree or an individual of exceptional ability, as well as a national interest waiver of the job offer requirement attached to this classification. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(2), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2).

The Director of the Texas Service Center denied the petition, concluding that the record did not establish that a waiver of the required job offer, and thus of the labor certification, would be in the national interest. We dismissed the Petitioner's appeal, a subsequent motion to reconsider and a further motion to reopen. The matter is now before us on another motion to reconsider.

The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). Upon review, we will dismiss the motion.

A motion to reconsider must establish that our prior decision was based on an incorrect application of law or policy and that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence in the record of proceedings at the time of the decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3). Because the scope of a motion is limited to the prior decision, we will only review the latest decision in these proceedings. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i), (ii). We may grant motions that satisfy these requirements and demonstrate eligibility for the requested benefit.

On motion, the Petitioner contests the correctness of our prior decision. In support of the motion, the Petitioner relies on general assertions of eligibility for a national interest waiver but fails to cite any specific provisions of law or policy that render our prior decision erroneous at the time it was issued. He argues the additional evidence submitted with the prior motion to reopen demonstrated this eligibility, and our prior motion failed to adequately evaluate the evidence. The Petitioner's contentions in his current motion merely reargue facts and issues we have already considered in our previous decisions. *See e.g., Matter of O-S-G-*, 24 I&N Dec. 56, 58 (BIA 2006) ("a motion to reconsider is not a process by which a party may submit, in essence, the same brief presented on appeal

and seek reconsideration by generally alleging error in the prior Board decision"). We will not re-adjudicate the petition anew and, therefore, the underlying petition remains denied.

ORDER: The motion to reconsider is dismissed.