




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy.**

PUBLIC COPY

B3




File: [Redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 13 2006
WAC 97 242 50935

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as Outstanding Professor or Researcher Pursuant to
Section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(B)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, initially approved the employment-based immigrant visa petition. On further review of the record, the director determined that the petitioner was not eligible for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director properly served the petitioner with notice of intent to revoke the approval of the visa petition, and his reasons therefore, and ultimately revoked the approval of the petition on August 25, 2005. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

The petitioner lists its type of business as “university.” It seeks to classify the beneficiary as an outstanding professor pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(B). The petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an associate professor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary is recognized internationally as outstanding in his academic field, as required for classification as an outstanding professor. The director also questioned whether the petitioner was a qualifying employer for the classification sought.

The appeal was filed on Thursday, September 22, 2005, 28 days after the decision was rendered. According to the pertinent regulations, the appeal was not timely filed. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(d) states that revocations of approvals must be appealed within 15 days after the service of the notice of revocation. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 18 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The notice of revocation advised the petitioner of the 18-day deadline.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2) states that, if an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the service center director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The director declined to treat the late appeal as a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.