

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
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

C1

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **APR 16 2010**
EAC 05 218 51710

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

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), as described at Section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. 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. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).


Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, initially approved the employment-based immigrant visa petition. On further review, the Director, California Service Center determined that the beneficiary was not eligible for the visa preference classification. Accordingly, the director properly served the petitioner with a Notice of Intent to Revoke the approval of the preference visa petition and her reasons for doing so, and subsequently exercised her discretion to revoke the approval of the petition on May 5, 2009. The petition 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.

The self-petitioner seeks classification as a special immigrant religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), to perform services as a Hindu priest. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that he had worked continuously in a qualifying religious occupation or vocation for two full years immediately preceding the filing of the visa petition.

Section 205 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1155, states that the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security “may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204.”

Regarding the revocation on notice of an immigrant petition under section 205 of the Act, the Board of Immigration Appeals has stated:

In *Matter of Estime*, . . . this Board stated that a notice of intention to revoke a visa petition is properly issued for "good and sufficient cause" where the evidence of record at the time the notice is issued, if unexplained and un rebutted, would warrant a denial of the visa petition based upon the petitioner's failure to meet his burden of proof. The decision to revoke will be sustained where the evidence of record at the time the decision is rendered, including any evidence or explanation submitted by the petitioner in rebuttal to the notice of intention to revoke, would warrant such denial.

Matter of Ho, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 590 (BIA 1988)(citing *Matter of Estime*, 19 I&N 450 (BIA 1987)).

By itself, the director's realization that a petition was incorrectly approved is good and sufficient cause for the issuance of a notice of intent to revoke an immigrant petition. *Id.*

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(d) states, in pertinent part:

The petitioner or self-petitioner may appeal the decision to revoke the approval within 15 days after the service of notice of the revocation.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B) states:

Untimely appeal – (1) Rejection without refund of filing fee. An appeal which is not filed within the time allowed must be rejected as improperly filed. In such a case, any filing fee the Service has accepted will not be refunded.

The record indicates that the director issued the decision on May 5, 2009. We note that the director improperly advised the petitioner that he had 30 days in which to file the appeal. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 205.2(d) provides the petitioner a period of only 15 days within which to submit an appeal from a notice of revocation of approval of a petition. The regulation is binding on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) employees in their administration of the Act, and USCIS employees do not have the authority to extend that filing period. *See, e.g., Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission*, 613 F.2d 1120 (C.A.D.C., 1979) (an agency is bound by its own regulations); *Reuters Ltd. v. F.C.C.*, 781 F.2d 946, (C.A.D.C., 1986) (an agency must adhere to its own rules and regulations; ad hoc departures from those rules, even to achieve laudable aims, cannot be sanctioned). An agency is not entitled to deference if it fails to follow its own regulations. *U.S. v. Heffner*, 420 F.2d 809, (C.A. Md. 1969) (government agency must scrupulously observe rules or procedures which it has established and when it fails to do so its action cannot stand and courts will strike it down); *Morton v. Ruiz*, 415 U.S. 199 (1974) (where the rights of individuals are affected, it is incumbent upon agencies to follow their own procedures).

The appeal was received by USCIS on June 3, 2009, or 29 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed. As the petitioner failed to timely appeal the director's notice of revocation of the visa preference classification, the appeal will be rejected. Nevertheless, 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 meets the requirements of a motion. 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 on motion and render a new decision accordingly.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The matter is returned to the director for consideration on motion.