


Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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

PUBLIC COPY



56

FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JAN 06 2010

IN RE:

Petitioner:



Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) Pursuant to § 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(K)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

The petitioner is a naturalized citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of the Philippines, as the fiancée of a U.S. citizen pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(K).

The director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition because the petitioner failed to establish that he and the beneficiary had met within the two years immediately preceding the filing of the petition.

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 the decision on May 21, 2009. It is noted that the director properly gave notice to the petitioner that he had 33 days to file the appeal. The appeal was received by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) on June 25, 2009, or 35 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)(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 a motion. The AAO acknowledges the petitioner's statement and additional evidence on appeal showing that he and the beneficiary have been communicating by telephone from November 2006 through the present. Section 214(d) of the Act, however, requires the petitioner and the beneficiary to have personally met within the two years immediately preceding the filing of the petition. In this case, the petition was filed on November 20, 2008, and thus the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have personally met between November 20, 2006 and November 20, 2008. On appeal, the petitioner has not provided any evidence to establish that he and the beneficiary had personally met within the two years immediately preceding the filing of the petition or that he should be exempt from such a requirement.

As the appeal was untimely filed and the petitioner has failed to provide any new facts or evidence that support a motion to reopen or reconsider, the appeal must be rejected.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected as untimely filed. The petition is denied.