

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass Ave. N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE: [Redacted]
EAC 03 029 54184

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: OCT 01 2007

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:




PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was initially approved by the Director, Vermont Service Center. On further review of the record, the director determined that the beneficiary was not eligible for the benefit sought. The director served the petitioner with notice of intent to revoke the approval of the preference visa petition. The director subsequently revoked approval of the petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(d) provides that a petitioner “may appeal the decision to revoke the approval within 15 days after the service of notice of the revocation.” Three additional days are provided if the notification of revocation was mailed. If the last day of the designated period falls on a Saturday, Sunday or a legal holiday, the period will run until the end of the next day, which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1.1(h). The date of filing is not the date of mailing, but the date of actual receipt. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record indicates that the Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (I-140) was initially approved on April 14, 2003. The director subsequently concluded that the I-140 was approved in error and notified the petitioner of his intent to revoke the petition on June 16, 2006. The petitioner's response failed to convince the director to revise his decision and the petition's approval was revoked on July 27, 2006, pursuant to section 205 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1155.

It is noted that the director's decision to revoke the petition properly gave notice to the petitioner that it had 18 days to file the appeal. It is further noted that a date shown on the I-290B, Notice of Appeal provided by the director erroneously stated the appellate deadline as August 29, 2006. However, it remains the petitioner's burden to file a timely appeal. An untimely appeal shall be rejected as improperly filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(1).

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 18-day time limit for filing an appeal. The 18-day deadline for filing an appeal from the director's decision of July 27, 2006 to revoke the petition's approval fell on Monday, August 14, 2006. Here, the director received the appeal on Wednesday, August 23, 2006. 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.

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 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 Service policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also 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). A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

Here, the untimely appeal, does not meet the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider. Therefore, there is no requirement to treat the appeal as a motion under 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2).

As the appeal was untimely filed and does not qualify as a motion, the appeal must be rejected.

Accordingly, the petitioner's appeal is rejected as untimely filed.

ORDER: The petitioner's appeal is rejected.