

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:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JAN 02 2008

WAC 05 047 51495

IN RE:


Petitioner:



Beneficiary:

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the employment-based visa petition that is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that the affected party, in order to properly file an appeal from a denial, must file the complete appeal within 30 days 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 date of filing is not the date of mailing, but the date of actual receipts. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record indicates that the director issued the decision on November 9, 2005. The director properly gave notice to the petitioner that it had 33 days to file the appeal. Although counsel dated the appeal December 8, 2005, it was delivered by FedEx and received by the director on December 19, 2005, 40 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly the appeal was untimely filed. The director erroneously annotated the appeal as timely and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

Neither the Immigration and Nationality Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day limit for filing and appeal. 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.

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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3). A motion that does not meet the applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

Here the untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reconsider. 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). Therefore, the director must consider the untimely appeal as a motion to reconsider and render a new decision accordingly.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The matter is returned to the director for consideration as a motion to reconsider.