

identifying data deleted to
prevent unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

D2



FILE: WAC 07 138 52456 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: FEB 29 2008

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:

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.

Joe
Michael T. Kelly
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant 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 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 May 10, 2007. It is noted that the instructions on the Form I-290B (Notice of Appeal) gave notice to the petitioner that it had 33 days to file the appeal. Although the petitioner dated the appeal June 11, 2007, it was received by CIS on June 13, 2007, or 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.

An untimely filed appeal must meet specific requirements to be treated as a motion. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) requires that a motion to reopen state the new facts to be provided in the reopened proceeding, supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Furthermore, 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) requires that 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 CIS policy.

Review of the record indicates that the appeal does not meet either of these requirements.

The director denied the petition on the ground that the beneficiary did not meet the requirements specified in section 214(g)(5)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(C), and thus the beneficiary was subject to the annual cap. The 2008 fiscal-year cap for the issuance of H-1B visas, set by section 214(g)(1)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(1)(A), was reached on April 1, 2007. Although the petitioner filed the Form I-129 petition on April 2, 2007, the petition was accepted and adjudicated because the petitioner indicated on the Form I-129 that the beneficiary met the cap exemption criterion at section 214(g)(5)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(C), as a beneficiary who, in the words of the Act, “has earned a master's or higher degree from a United States institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).”

On appeal, the petitioner argues that at the time of filing on April 2, 2007, the beneficiary had completed all of the requirements for a master's degree, and on April 19, 2007 took her final exam and thus is eligible for the classification sought. The petitioner submits a transcript reflecting that the beneficiary was conferred a master of arts in communications arts in May 2007. As the beneficiary took her final exam on April 19, 2007 and was not conferred a master's degree until May 2007, the beneficiary thus did not meet the requirements specified in section 214(g)(5)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(g)(5)(C) as of the filing date. The petitioner does not provide any relevant facts to be considered in the reopened proceeding, nor does the petitioner

provide relevant documentary evidence. Furthermore, the petitioner neither states a clear reason for reconsideration nor provides any precedent decision to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or CIS policy. For these reasons, the director appropriately declined to treat the appeal as a motion to reopen or reconsider.

As the appeal was untimely filed and the petitioner has failed to provide any new facts or evidence that support a motion to reopen, the appeal must be rejected.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected as untimely filed.