

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

[REDACTED]

C1

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 17 2008  
WAC 06 169 50714

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

PETITION: Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), as described at Section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

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.

*Mari Johnson*

John F. Grissom, Acting Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, California Service Center, initially approved the employment-based immigrant visa petition. On further review, the director determined that the beneficiary was not eligible for the visa preference classification. Accordingly, the director properly served the petitioner with a Notice of Intent to Revoke the approval of the preference visa petition and her reasons for doing so, and subsequently exercised her discretion to revoke the approval of the petition on September 9, 2008. The petition is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

The petitioner is a Buddhist temple. It seeks to classify the beneficiary as a special immigrant religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), to perform services as a monk. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had extended a qualifying job offer to the beneficiary.

Section 205 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1155, states that the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security “may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204.”

Regarding the revocation on notice of an immigrant petition under section 205 of the Act, the Board of Immigration Appeals has stated:

*In Matter of Estime*, . . . this Board stated that a notice of intention to revoke a visa petition is properly issued for "good and sufficient cause" where the evidence of record at the time the notice is issued, if unexplained and un rebutted, would warrant a denial of the visa petition based upon the petitioner's failure to meet his burden of proof. The decision to revoke will be sustained where the evidence of record at the time the decision is rendered, including any evidence or explanation submitted by the petitioner in rebuttal to the notice of intention to revoke, would warrant such denial.

*Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 590 (BIA 1988)(citing *Matter of Estime*, 19 I&N 450 (BIA 1987)).

By itself, the director's realization that a petition was incorrectly approved is good and sufficient cause for the issuance of a notice of intent to revoke an immigrant petition. *Id.*

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(d) states, in pertinent part:

The petitioner or self-petitioner may appeal the decision to revoke the approval within 15 days after the service of notice of the revocation.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B) states:

*Untimely appeal – (1) Rejection without refund of filing fee.* An appeal which is not filed within the time allowed must be rejected as improperly filed. In such a case, any filing fee the Service has accepted will not be refunded.

The record indicates that the director issued the decision on September 9, 2008. It is noted that the director improperly advised the petitioner that it had 30 days in which to file the appeal. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(d) provides the petitioner a period of only 15 days within which to submit an appeal from a notice of revocation of approval of a petition. The regulation is binding on USCIS employees in their administration of the Act, and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) employees do not have the authority to extend that filing period. *See, e.g., Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission*, 613 F.2d 1120 (C.A.D.C., 1979) (an agency is bound by its own regulations); *Reuters Ltd. v. F.C.C.*, 781 F.2d 946, (C.A.D.C., 1986) (an agency must adhere to its own rules and regulations; ad hoc departures from those rules, even to achieve laudable aims, cannot be sanctioned). An agency is not entitled to deference if it fails to follow its own regulations. *U.S. v. Heffner*, 420 F.2d 809, (C.A. Md. 1969) (government agency must scrupulously observe rules or procedures which it has established and when it fails to do so its action cannot stand and courts will strike it down); *Morton v. Ruiz*, 415 U.S. 199 (1974) (where the rights of individuals are affected, it is incumbent upon agencies to follow their own procedures). Furthermore, the AAO's authority over the service centers is comparable to the relationship between a court of appeals and a district court. Even if a service center director incorrectly advised the petitioner that it had 30 days to file an appeal from a decision to revoke approval of a petition, the AAO would not be bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. *Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS*, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D. La.), *aff'd*, 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S.Ct. 51 (2001).

The appeal was received by USCIS on October 9, 2008, or 30 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

As the petitioner failed to timely appeal the director's notice of revocation of the visa preference classification, the appeal will be rejected.

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected.