

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**


U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6




File: [Redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 28 2006  
EAC-05-018-52323

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:



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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

In order to properly file an appeal, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that the affected party must file the complete appeal within 30 days of after service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b).

The record indicates that the director issued the decision on March 16, 2005. It is noted that the director properly gave notice to the petitioner that it had 33 days to file the appeal. Although counsel dated the appeal April 8, 2005, it was received by Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) on April 13, 2005, signed by the wrong party, the beneficiary and not the petitioner. The appeal was returned. The appeal was refilled and was then received by CIS on April 29, 2005, or 44 days after the decision was issued. The returned petition was signed by the petitioner, but still contained the name and address of the beneficiary as the person filing the appeal. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed, and does not properly designate the petitioner as the party appealing. CIS regulations specifically prohibit a beneficiary of a visa petition, or a representative acting on a beneficiary's behalf, from filing an appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii)(B).

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.