



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D2

[REDACTED]

DATE: **NOV 06 2012**

OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

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

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: SELF-REPRESENTED

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,

M. Rhew
Jor

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the instant nonimmigrant visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as improperly filed.

In the Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129), the petitioner described itself as an enterprise engaged in research, design, and development of integrated circuits and semiconductor system solutions. To employ the beneficiary in what it designates as an SMSC "MOST" principle automotive applications engineer position, the petitioner endeavors to classify him as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation 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).

The director denied the petition on April 21, 2011, concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions.

Alleged counsel for the petitioner subsequently filed a timely appeal on May 20, 2011.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(2) states, in part, the following:

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.

Effective March 4, 2010, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 292.4(a) requires that a "new [Form G-28] must be filed with an appeal filed with the [AAO]." Title 8 C.F.R. § 292.4(a) further requires that the Form G-28 "must be properly completed and signed by the petitioner, applicant, or respondent to authorize representation in order for the appearance to be recognized by DHS." The record, however, does not contain a new, properly executed Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Accredited Representative, personally signed by both counsel and by an authorized official of the petitioning entity.

In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(2)(iii), the AAO sent counsel a facsimile on September 26, 2012 notifying him that a properly executed Form G-28, signed by counsel and the consenting affected party, must be submitted to the AAO within fifteen (15) calendar days. However, counsel failed to respond to this request. Therefore, the AAO concludes that the appeal was improperly filed and must be rejected pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(A)(1), which calls for rejection of an improperly filed appeal, where the person filing it is not entitled to do so.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.