PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

B4

[redacted]

FEB 23 2005

FILE: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:
WAC 01 030 52999

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary: [redacted]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(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.

Michael Rust for

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, initially approved the employment-based petition. Upon subsequent review, the director issued a notice of intent to revoke approval and ultimately revoked approval of the petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i), an application received in a Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) office shall be stamped to show the time and date of actual receipt, if it is properly signed, executed, and accompanied by the correct fee. For calculating the date of filing, the appeal shall be regarded as properly filed on the date that it is so stamped by the service center or district office.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(d) indicates that revocations of approvals must be appealed within 15 days after the service of the Notice of Revocation. The record indicates that the Notice of Revocation was mailed on November 17, 2003. The appeal was filed on December 19, 2003, 32 days after the decision was mailed. Thus, the appeal was not timely filed.

It is noted that the director erroneously allowed the petitioner 30 days to file the appeal (33 days if the notice was delivered by mail). The director's error does not, and cannot, supersede the regulation regarding the time allotted to appeal a revocation.

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.