

PUBLIC COPY



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

Identifying data deleted to
prevent unauthorized
invasion of personal privacy

DD

JAN 27 2004

FILE: LIN 01 212 54108 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date:


IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(1) as untimely filed.

The petitioner is a construction company. It seeks authorization to employ the beneficiary as a systems analyst. The director denied the petition because the petitioner did not establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

An affected party has 30 days from the date of an adverse decision to file an appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i). If the adverse decision was served by mail, an additional three days is added to the proscribed period. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The record reflects that the director sent his decision of August 8, 2002 to the petitioner at its address of record. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) received the appeal 34 days later on September 11, 2002. Therefore, the appeal was untimely filed.

An appeal that is not filed within the time allowed must be rejected as improperly filed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(1). If, however, an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2).

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). A motion to reconsider must: (1) 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 CIS policy; and (2) establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3).

On appeal, counsel states that CIS should have taken into account that the petitioner was self-represented at the time of filing and “should have given petitioner greater guidance on the prerequisites of an approvable petition.” Counsel also asserts that the duties described by the petitioner required at least a bachelor’s degree and that the salary offered was commensurate with a position requiring a bachelor’s degree. Neither counsel nor the petitioner submits evidence relating to, or presents any statements in rebuttal to, the director’s finding that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation.

As neither counsel nor the petitioner presents new facts to be considered, or provides any precedent decisions to establish that the director’s denial was based on an incorrect application of law or Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) policy, the appeal will not be treated as a motion to reopen or reconsider and will, therefore, be rejected.

As always, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected as untimely filed.