



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY
identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

B6



File: [Redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 10 2008
WAC 03 189 53845

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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)

IN 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.

Robert P. Wiemann for
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: On July 27, 2004, the Director, California Service Center, initially approved the employment-based preference visa petition. In connection with a prior Form G-325A for the beneficiary filed in conjunction with the beneficiary's husband's Form I-589, Request for Asylum in the United States, the director served the petitioner with notice of intent to revoke the approval of the petition (NOIR). In a Notice of Revocation (NOR), the director ultimately revoked the approval of the Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140). The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed. The AAO will return the matter to the director for consideration as a motion to reconsider.

In order to properly file an appeal of a revocation, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(d) provides that the affected party must file the appeal within 15 days after service of the NOR. In her NOR, the director noted that if mailed, the petitioner's Form I-290B had to be received in the director's office within 18 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(d). 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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 1.1(h) states:

The term *day* when computing the period of time for taking any action provided in this chapter including the taking of an appeal, shall include Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, except that when the last day of the period so computed falls on a Saturday, Sunday or a legal holiday, the period shall run until the end of the next day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, nor a legal holiday.

The record indicates that the director issued the decision on April 23, 2007. It is noted that the director properly gave notice to the petitioner that it had 15 days to file the appeal, with an additional three days provided if the appeal was mailed. Although counsel dated the appeal May 10, 2007, it was received by CIS on May 14, 2007, or 21 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed. The director erroneously annotated the appeal as timely and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

Neither the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 18-day time limit for filing an appeal based on 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.

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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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 meets the requirements of a motion to reconsider. Counsel states that the record does not contain any false information and that the forms contained in the record are not inconsistent with regard to the beneficiary's relevant prior work experience. 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). Therefore, the director must consider the untimely appeal as a motion to reconsider and render a new decision accordingly.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The matter is returned to the director for consideration as a motion to reconsider.