



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



D2

Date: **APR 03 2012**

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

IN RE:


Petitioner:

Beneficiary:



PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. Please note that all documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please also note that any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Thank you,

for Michael T. Rhew

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the instant nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. 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 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 director issued the decision on September 6, 2011. A rejection notice in the record indicates that counsel initially submitted the appeal without the required signature. The unsigned appeal was returned to counsel. Counsel subsequently signed the appeal, dated it October 11, 2011, and resubmitted it. The completed appeal was not received by the until Friday, October 14, 2011, 38 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. 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 California Service Center. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii).

Here, as the brief in this matter was submitted directly to the AAO in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(viii), it is apparent that the director did not have an opportunity to fully review the late appeal to determine whether it meets the requirements of either a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider. Therefore, the matter will be returned to the director. If the director determines that the late appeal meets the requirements of a motion, the motion shall be granted and a new decision will be issued.

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

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.