

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



C1

FILE: [Redacted] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: **SEP 09 2005**  
SRC 04 001 52088

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

2 Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center. The petitioner filed a Form EOIR-29, Notice of Appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals from a Decision of an INS Officer. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(n)(2), jurisdiction for an appeal of the denial of an employment based visa petition lies with the Associate Commissioner of Examinations (the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)). Therefore, the appeal should have been filed on Form I-290B. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i). In this case, the appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

The petitioner is a church. 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 pastor or pastor's assistant. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been engaged continuously in a qualifying religious vocation or occupation for two full years immediately preceding the filing of the petition, that the beneficiary had worked in the same capacity as that of the proffered position for two full years immediately preceding the filing of the visa petition, that the petitioner had extended a qualifying job offer to the beneficiary, or that it had the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage.

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 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 9, 2005. The petitioner's appeal, dated April 9, 2005, was received by the service center on April 12, 2005, 34 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

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.