

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B3

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: **SEP 24 2010**

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as Outstanding Professor or Researcher Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(B)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

The petitioner seeks to classify himself as an outstanding researcher pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(B). The director determined that the petitioner self-petitioned in a classification that requires a U.S. employer petitioner.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(i)(1) provides:

Any United States *employer* desiring and intending to employ a professor or researcher who is outstanding in an academic field under section 203(b)(1)(B) of the Act *may file an I-140 visa petition* for such classification.

The director denied the petition because the petition was filed by the alien seeking classification as an outstanding researcher instead of by an employer.

On appeal, the petitioner states that the first page of the Form I-140 petition indicates that he could file a petition in his own behalf. That language does not, in fact, appear on the first page of the petition. The first page of the instructions for the Form I-140 petition states that an alien may self petition for two separate classifications under section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act and section 203(b)(2)(B) of the Act, neither of which is at issue in the matter before us.

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 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 date of filing is not the date of mailing, but the date of actual receipt with the required fee. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record indicates that the director issued the decision on December 2, 2009. It is noted that the director properly gave notice to the petitioner that he had 33 days to file the appeal and listed the proper fee for an appeal. Although the petitioner dated the appeal December 30, 2009, it was received with the proper fee by the director on Wednesday, January 6, 2010, 35 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing an appeal. 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, when filed, 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 when filed shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4). The petitioner did not submit additional evidence or legal authority that would allow an alien to self-petition for the classification sought.

Here, the untimely appeal did not meet the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider when it was filed. 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.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.