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

D14

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 13 2010

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]

PETITION: Petition for U Nonimmigrant Classification as a Victim of a Qualifying Crime Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(U)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

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. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently $585, but will increase to $630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the $630 fee. 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, Vermont Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The petitioner seeks nonimmigrant classification under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("the Act"), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(U), as an alien victim of certain qualifying criminal activity.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner did not establish that: (1) she has been the victim of qualifying criminal activity; (2) she has suffered substantial physical and mental abuse as a result of having been the victim of qualifying criminal activity; (3) she possesses credible and reliable information establishing that she has knowledge of the details concerning the qualifying criminal activity upon which her petition is based; (4) she has been, is being, or is likely to be helpful to United States (U.S.) law enforcement authorities investigating or prosecuting qualifying criminal activity; and (5) the qualifying criminal activity violated the laws of the United States or occurred in the United States.

In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i), an application received in a U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) office shall be stamped to show the time and date of actual receipt, if it is properly signed, executed, and accompanied by the correct fee. For calculating the date of filing, the appeal shall be regarded as properly filed on the date that it is so stamped by the service center or district office. 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 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 record indicates that the director issued his decision on March 30, 2010. We note that the director informed the petitioner to file any appeal or motion with his office, the Vermont Service Center. Counsel, however, improperly mailed the appeal to the AAO, and the AAO returned it to counsel for proper filing with the Vermont Service Center. According to the date stamp on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, the Vermont Service Center received the petitioner's appeal on May 11, 2010, or 42 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)(1) states that an appeal which is not filed within the time allotted must be rejected as improperly 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. An untimely-filed appeal must meet specific requirements to be treated as a motion. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) requires that a motion to reopen state the new facts to be provided in the reopened proceeding, supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Furthermore, 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) requires that 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 USCIS policy.

Review of the record indicates that the appeal does not meet the requirements of either a motion to reopen or reconsider. Counsel's brief primarily reiterates sections of the statute and regulations pertaining to the U nonimmigrant classification, and does not address the specific reasons for denial that the director articulated in his letter, particularly his discussion of the petitioner's failure to demonstrate that the perpetrators of the alleged crime did it as a means to avoid or frustrate efforts to investigate, arrest, prosecute or otherwise be brought to justice for other criminal activity, or to further the abuse, exploitation or undue control over the petitioner through the manipulation of the legal system. The AAO, therefore, does not find that the appellate filing contains new evidence or provides any arguments to establish that the director incorrectly applied the law or USCIS policy.

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met. As the appeal was untimely filed and the petitioner's appellate filing does not meet the requirements of a motion to reopen or reconsider, the appeal must be rejected pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(1).

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The petition is denied.