

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



B5

Date: NOV 04 2011 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE:

IN RE: Petitioner:   
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based preference visa petition. The petitioner subsequently filed two appeals, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] with the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The AAO will reject the appeal with receipt number [REDACTED] as untimely filed.

The petitioner is a software development and consulting business. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a computer software engineer of applications pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2). As required by statute, an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, which the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) approved, accompanied the petition. The director determined that the beneficiary did not meet the specified job requirements or qualify for the classification sought. The director denied the petition accordingly.

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 or the attorney or representative of record 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 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 service center director issued the decision on June 27, 2011. It is noted that the service center director properly gave notice to the petitioner that it had 33 days to file the appeal. Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend this time limit.

Although counsel dated the cover letter for the Form I-290B July 28, 2011, it was not received by the service center until Tuesday, August 2, 2011, or 36 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. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the Director of the Texas Service Center. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii).

Moreover, in accordance with the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 292.4(a) as well as the instructions to the Form I-290B, the petitioner must file a new Form G-28 with an appeal to the AAO. This regulation applies to all appeals filed on or after March 4, 2010. *See* 75 Fed. Reg. 5225 (Feb. 2, 2010).

[REDACTED], the petitioner's director of operations, signed a notarized Power of Attorney (POA) on March 12, 2008. The document purports to authorize [REDACTED], "to sign our company's H1B and other related petitions" on [REDACTED] behalf. As will be

discussed, this document does not meet the signature requirements of any of the controlling USCIS regulations.

Significantly, counsel signed the Form G-28 accompanying the appeal both as the attorney and on behalf of the petitioner pursuant to a “Restricted” POA dated March 12, 2008. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 292.4(a) (1994) provides:

An appearance shall be filed on the appropriate form by the attorney or representative appearing in each case. During Immigration Judge or Board proceedings, withdrawal and/or substitution of counsel is permitted only in accordance with Sec. 3.16 and 3.36 respectively. During proceedings before the Service, substitution may be permitted upon the written withdrawal of the attorney or representative of record, or upon notification of the new attorney or representative. When an appearance is made by a person acting in a representative capacity, his or her personal appearance or signature shall constitute a representation that under the provisions of this chapter he or she is authorized and qualified to represent. Further proof of authority to act in a representative capacity may be required. *A notice of appearance entered in application or petition proceedings must be signed by the applicant or petitioner to authorize representation in order for the appearance to be recognized by the Service.*

(Emphasis added.) The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(3) provides that where a notice of representation on Form G-28 is “not properly signed, the application or petition will be processed as if the notice had not been submitted.”<sup>1</sup>

The POA is not a properly executed Form G-28 and does not meet the requirements of the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 292.4(a). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(2) provides the following with respect to appeals by attorneys without a proper Form G-28:

---

<sup>1</sup> Not only does the petitioner’s signature on the Form G-28 authorize representation by an attorney or accredited representative in matters before USCIS, it serves as a consent to disclosure of information covered under the Privacy Act of 1974. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (legacy INS) first implemented the requirement that a petitioner or applicant sign the Form G-28 in the final rule “Changes in Processing Procedures for Certain Applications and Petitions for Immigration Benefits” 59 Fed. Reg. 1455 (Jan. 11, 1994). In response to several commenters who suggested that the attorney need be the only signatory on the Form G-28, the agency explained that other commenters had properly noted that capture of the petitioner’s signature on the Form G-28 “would address potential Privacy Act concerns.” The agency emphasized that the “petitioner must sign the Form G-28 to definitively indicate to the Service that he or she has authorized the person to represent him or her in the proceeding.” 59 Fed. Reg. 1455 (Jan. 11, 1994). A 2010 revision to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 292.4(a) retains the requirement that a petitioner or applicant sign the Form G-28. 75 Fed. Reg. 5225 (Feb. 2, 2010).

(i) *General.* If an appeal is filed by an attorney or representative without a properly executed Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative (Form G-28) entitling that person to file the appeal, the appeal is considered improperly filed. In such a case, any filing fee the Service has accepted will not be refunded regardless of the action taken.

(ii) *When favorable action warranted.* If the reviewing official decides favorable action is warranted with respect to an otherwise properly filed appeal, that official shall ask the attorney or representative to submit Form G-28 to the official's office within 15 days of the request. If Form G-28 is not submitted within the time allowed, the official may, on his or her own motion, under Sec. 103.5(a)(5)(i) of this part, make a new decision favorable to the affected party without notifying the attorney or representative.

(iii) *When favorable action not warranted.* If the reviewing official decides favorable action is not warranted with respect to an otherwise properly filed appeal, that official shall ask the attorney or representative to submit Form G-28 directly to the AAU. The official shall also forward the appeal and the relating record of proceeding to the AAU. The appeal may be considered properly filed as of its original filing date if the attorney or representative submits a properly executed Form G-28 entitling that person to file the appeal.

The AAO notes that the integrity of the immigration process depends on the actual employer signing the official immigration forms under penalty of perjury. Allowing an attorney to sign all immigration documents on behalf of the petitioner based on a broad assignment of authorization would leave the immigration system open to fraudulent filings. While the AAO does not allege any malfeasance in this matter, the AAO notes prior examples where attorneys have been convicted of various charges, including money laundering and immigration fraud, after signing immigration forms of which the alien or employer had no knowledge. *United States v. O'Connor*, 158 F.Supp.2d 697, 710 (E.D. Va. 2001); *United States v. Kooritzky*, Case No. [REDACTED] (E.D. Va. December 11, 2002).

If the appeal were timely, the AAO would request a new Form G-28 signed by the petitioner pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(2). As the appeal is untimely, however, such a request is unnecessary.

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected.